THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVII.—OCTOBER, 1902—No. 108.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE XIII.

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA.

AD PATRIARCHAS, PRIMATES, ARCHIEPISCOPOS, EPISCOPOS, ALIOSQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIOS PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES

DE SANCTISSIMA EUCHARISTIA.

Venerabilibus Fratribus, Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis Aliisque Locorum Ordinariis Pacem et Communionem cum Apostolica Sede Habentibus

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES

Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

MIRAE caritatis in hominum salutem exempla, quae a Iesu Christo praelucent, Nos quidem pro sanctitate officii inspicere et persequi adhuc studuimus, ad extremumque vitae spiritum, ipso opitulante, studebimus. Nam tempora nacti nimis acriter veritati et iustitiae infensa, quantum erat in Nobis,

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1901, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

docendo, admonendo, agendo, prout nuperrima ad vos epistola Apostolica confirmavit, nequaquam intermisimus ea late praestare, quae sive ad multiplicem errorum contagionem depellendam, sive ad nervos intendendos christianae vitae aptius conducere viderentur. In his autem duo sunt recentioris memoriae, omnino inter se coniuncta, unde Nosmetipsi opportunae consolationis fructum, tot prementibus aegritudinis causis, recolendo percipimus. Alterum, quum optimum factu censuimus augusto Cordi Christi Redemptoris universitatem humani generis peculiari ritu devoveri; alterum, quum omnes christianum nomen profitentes gravissime hortati sumus, ut Ei ipsi adhaererent, qui vel singulis vel iure sociatis *via, veritas, vita* divinitus est.—Nunc vero eadem ipsa, advigilante in Ecclesiae tempora, Apostolica caritate movemur ac prope impellimur ut aliud quiddam ad ea proposita iam confecta, tamquam perfectionem suam addamus, ut videlicet christiano populo maiorem in modum commendemus sanctissimam Eucharistiam, quippe donum divinissimum ex intimo plane Corde prolatum eiusdem Redemptoris, *desiderio desiderantis* singularem huiusmodi cum hominibus coniunctionem, maximeque factum ad saluberrimos fructus redemptionis eius dilargiendos. Quamquam in hoc etiam rerum genere nonnulla vel antehac Nos auctoritate et studio curavimus. Iucundumque memoratu est inter cetera legitima Nos comprobatione ac privilegiis auxisse Instituta et Sodalitia non pauca, divinae Hostiae perpetua vice adorandae addicta; operam item dedisse ut conventus eucharistici digna cum celebritate parique utilitate haberentur, iisdem praeterea similisque causae operibus patronum caelestem attribuisse Paschalem Baylon, qui mysterii eucharistici cultor extitit insigniter pius.—Itaque, Venerabiles Fratres, de hoc ipso mysterio in quo tuendo illustrandoque constanter tum Ecclesiae sollertia, non sine praeclaris Martyrum palmis, elaboravit, tum praestantissimorum hominum doctrina, eloquentia variaeque artes splendide contenderunt, libet capita quaedam alloquendo complecti; idque ut apertior atque expressior patescat eiusdem virtus, qua maxime parte se dat praesentissimam hisce necessitatibus temporum allevandis. Sane, quandoquidem Christus Dominus sub excessum mortalis cursus istud reliquit caritatis immensae in homines monumentum, idemque praesidium maximum "pro mundi vita" (Ioann. vi., 52), nihil Nobis de vita proxime cessuris optare felicius possumus quam ut liceat excitare in omnium animis atque alere memoris gratiae debitaeque religionis affectum erga Sacramentum mirabile, in quo salutis et pacis, solicitis omnium studiis quaesitae, spem atque efficientiam maxime niti arbitramur.

Quod saeculo, usquequaque pertubato et laboranti tam misere, talibus Nos remediis adiumentisque ducimus praecipue consulen-

dum, non deerunt sane qui demirentur, et fortasse qui dicta Nostra procaci cum fastidio accipiant. Id nempe est potissimum a superbia: quo vitio animis insidente, elanguescat in iis christiana fides, quae obsequium vult mentis religiosissimum, necesse est, atque adeo caligo de divinis rebus tetrius incumbat: ut in multos illud cadat: "Quaecumque ignorant, blasphemant." (Iudae 10.) Iam vero tantum abest ut Nos propterea ab inito avocemur consilio, ut certum sit contentiore potius studio et recte animatis lumen afferre et sancta vituperantibus veniam a Deo, fraterna piorum imploratione, exorare.

Sanctissimae Eucharistiae virtutem integra fide nosse qualis sit, idem enimvero est ac nosse quale sit opus quod humani generis causâ Deus, homo factus, potenti misericordia perfecti. Nam ut est fidei rectae Christum profiteri et colere summum effectorem salutis nostrae, qui sapientia, legibus, institutis, exemplis, fusoque sanguine omnia instauravit; aeque est eumdem profiteri colere sic in Eucharistia reapse praesentem, ut verissime inter homines ad aevi perpetuitatem ipse permaneat, iisque partae redemptionis beneficia magister et pastor bonus, peracceptusque deprecator ad Patrem, perenni copia de semetipso impertiat.—Beneficia porro ex Eucharistia manantia qui studiose religioseque consideret, illud sane praestare atque eminere intelliget quo cetera quaecumque sunt continentur; ex ipsa nempe vitam in homines, quae vere vita est, influere: "Panis, quem ego dabo, caro mea est pro mundi vita." (Ioann. vi., 52.)—Non uno modo, quod alias docuimus, Christus est *vita;* qui adventus sui inter homines causam professus est eam, ut afferret ipsis certam vitae plus quam humanae ubertatem: "Ego veni ut vitam habeant, et abundantius habeant." (Ioann. x., 10.) Statim namque ut in terris "benignitas et humanitas apparuit Salvatoris nostri Dei" (Tit. iii., 4), nemo quidem ignorat vim quamdam continuo erupisse ordinis rerum prorsus novi procreatricem, eamque in venas omnes societatis civilis et domesticae permanasse. Novas inde homini cum homine necessitudines; nova publice et privatim iura, nova officia; institutis, disciplinis, artibus, novus cursus: quod autem praecipuum, hominum animos et studia ad veritatem religionis sanctitatemque morum traducta; atque adeo vitam homini communicatam, caelestem plane ac divinam. Huc nimirum ea spectant, quae crebro in sacris litteris commemorantur, *lignum vitae, verbum vitae, liber vitae, corona vitae,* nominatimque *panis vitae.*

At vero, quoniam haec ipsa de qua dicimus vita expressam habet similitudinem cum vita hominis naturali, sicut altera cibo alitur atque viget, ita alteram sustentari cibo suo et augeri oportet. Apte hic facit revocare quo quidem Christus tempore ac modo moverit animos hominum et adduxerit ut panem vivum, quem daturus erat, convenienter probeque exciperent. Ubi enim manavit fama de prodigio

quod ille, multiplicatis panibus in satietatem multitudinis, patraverat ad litus Tiberiadis, confestim plures ad ipsum confluxerunt, si forte par sibi obtingeret beneficium. Tum Iesus, opportunitate arrepta, similiter ac quum feminae Samaritanae, ab haurienda puteali aqua; sitim ipse iniecerat "aquae salientis in vitam aeternam" (Ioann. iv., 14) cupidae multitudinis sic erigit mentes, ut panem alium cupidius appetant "qui permanet in vitam aeternam." (Ioann. vi., 27.) Neque vero huiusmodi panis, instat Iesus admonere, est manna illud caeleste, quod patribus vestris per deserta peregrinantibus praesto fuit; neque ille quidem quem ipsi nuper a me mirabundi accepistis; verum egomet sum panis iste: "Ego sum panis vitae." (Ioann. 48.) Idemque eo amplius suadet omnibus, et invitando et praeci piendo; "Si quis manducaverit ex hoc pane, vivet in aeternum; et panis quem ego dabo caro mea est pro mundi vita." (Ioann. 52.) Gravitatem porro praecepti ita ipse convincit: "Amen amen dico vobis, nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis et biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis." (Ioann. 54.)—Absit igitur pervagatus ille error perniciosissimus opinantium Eucharistiae usum ad eos fere amandandum esse qui vacui curis angustique animo conquiescere instituant in quodam vitae religiosioris proposito. Ea quippe res, qua nihil sane nec excellentius nec salutarius, ad omnes omnino, cuiuscumque demum muneris praestantiaeve sint, attinet, quotquot velint (neque unus quisquam non velle debet) divinae gratiae in se fovere vitam, cuius ultimum est adeptio vitae cum Deo beatae.

Atque utinam de sempiterna vita recte reputarent et providerent ii potissimum quorum vel ingenium vel industria vel auctoritas tantopere possunt ad res temporum atque hominum dirigendas. At vero videmus deploramusque ut plerique cum fastu existiment se novam veluti vitam eamque prosperam saeculo indidisse, propterea quod ipsum ad omne genus utilia et mirabilia inflammato cursu contendere suo impulso urgeant. Sed enim, quocumque aspexeris, humana societas, si a Deo aliena, potius quam quaesitâ fruatur tranquillitate rerum, perinde angitur et trepidat ut qui febri aestuque iactatur; prosperitati dum anxie studet eique unice fidit, fugientem sequitur, inhaeret labenti. Homines enim et civitates ut necessario ex Deo sunt, ita in alio nullo vivere, moveri, efficere boni quidquam, nisi in Deo per Iesum Christum queunt; per quem late profluxerunt et profluunt optima quaeque et lectissima.—Sed horum omnium fons et caput bonorum est potissimum augusta Eucharistia: quae quum eam alat sustentetque vitam cuius ex desiderio tam vehementer laboramus, tum dignitatem humanam quae tanti nunc fieri videtur, immensum auget. Nam quid maius aut optabilius, quam effici, quoad eius fieri possit, divinae participem consortemque naturae?

At enim hoc nobis Christus praestat in Eucharistia maxime, qua evectum ad divina, gratiae munere, hominem arctius etiam sibi adiungit et copulat. Id enim interest inter corporis cibum et animi, quod ille in nos convertitur, hic nos in se convertit; qua de re Christum ipsum Augustinus loquentem inducit: "Nec tu me in te mutabis sicut cibum carnis tuae, sed tu mutaberis in me." (Conf. l. vii., c. x.)

Ex hoc autem praecellentissimo Sacramento, in quo potissime apparet quemadmodum homines in divinam inseruntur naturam, iidem habent in omni supernarum virtutum genere incrementa maxima. Et primum in fide. Omni quidem tempore fides oppugnatores habuit; nam etsi hominum mentes praestantissimarum rerum cognitione extollit, quia tamen, quae supra naturam esse aperuit, qualia sint celat, eo videtur mentes ipsas deprimere. Sed olim tum hoc tum illud fidei caput oppugnabatur; deinceps multo latius exarsit bellum, eoque iam perventum est ut nihil omnino supra naturam esse affirmetur. Iamvero ad vigorem fervoremque fidei in animis redintegrandum perapte est, ut nihil magis, mysterium Eucharisticum, proprie *mysterium fidei* appellatum: hoc nimirum uno, quaecumque supra naturam sunt, singulari quadam miraculorum copia et varietate, universa continentur: "Memoriam fecit mirabilium suorum misericors et miserator Dominus, escam dedit timentibus se." (Ps. cx., 4, 5.) Si Deus enim quidquid supra naturam fecit, ad Verbi retulit Incarnationem, cuius beneficio restitueretur humani generis salus, secundum illud Apostoli: "Proposuit . . . instaurare omnia in Christo, quae in caelis, et quae in terra sunt, in ipso" (Eph. i., 9, 10); Eucharistia, Patrum sanctorum testimonio, Incarnationis continuatio quaedam et amplificatio censenda est. Siquidem per ipsam incarnati Verbi substantia cum singulis hominibus copulatur; et supremum in Calvaria sacrificium admirabili modo renovatur; id quod praesignificavit Malachias: "In omni loco sacrificatur et offertur nomini meo oblatio munda." (I. 11.) Quod miraculum, unum omnium in suo genere maximum, miracula comitantur innumerabilia; hic enim omnes naturae leges intermissae: tota substantia panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem Christi convertitur; panis et vini species, nulla re subiecta, divina virtute sustentantur; corpus Christi tam multa simul loca nanciscitur, quam multis simul in locis Sacramentum perficitur. Humanae autem rationis quo magis erga tantum Mysterium intendatur obsequium, quasi adiumento suppetunt prodigia, in eiusdem gloriam, veteri memoria et nostra patrata; quorum publica exstant non uno loco eaqua insignia monumenta. Hoc igitur Sacramento videmus fidem ali, mentem enutriri, rationalistarum commenta dilui, ordinem rerum quae supra naturam sunt maxime illustrari.

Sed ut divinarum rerum fides languescat, non modo superbia, quod supra attigimus, sed etiam depravatio facit animi. Nam si usu venit ut quo melius quisque est moratus, eo sit ad intelligendum sollertior, corporis autem voluptatibus mentes obtundi ipsa ethnica dispexit prudentia, divina sapientia praemonuit (Sap. I., 4); tanto magis in divinis rebus voluptates corporis obscurant fidei lumen, atque etiam, per iustam Dei animadversionem, extinguunt. Quarum quidem voluptatum insatiabilis hodie cupiditas flagrat, omnesque late tamquam contagio quaedam morbi vel a primis aetatulis inficit. Verum teterrimi huius mali praeclarum in divina Eucharistia praesto est remedium. Nam, omnium primum, augendo caritatem, libidinem coërcet; ait enim Augustinus: "Nutrimentum eius (caritatis) est imminutio cupiditatis; perfectio, nulla cupiditas." (De diversis quaestionibus lxxxiii., quaest. xxxvi.) Praeterea castissima Iesu caro carnis nostrae insolentiam comprimit, ut Cyrillus monuit Alexandrinus: "Christus enim existens in nobis sopit saevientem in nostris membris carnis legem." (Lib. iv., c. 2 in Ioann. vi., 57.) Quin etiam fructus Eucharistiae singularis et iucundissimus est quem significavit propheticum illud: "Quid bonum eius (Christi) est, et quid pulchrum eius, nisi frumentum electorum et vinum germinans virgines?" (Zach. ix., 17) videlicet sacrae virginitatis forte et constans propositum, quod, vel diffluente deliciis saeculo, latius in dies uberiusque in catholica Ecclesia florescit: quanto quidem ubique cum religionis ipsiusque humani convictus emolumento et ornamento est probe cognitum.—Accedit quod huiusmodi Sacramento spes bonorum immortalium, fiducia auxiliorum divinorum, mirifice roboratur. Beatitatis enim studium, quod omnium animis insitum atque innatum est, terrestrium bonorum fallacia, iniusta flagitiosorum hominum vi, ceteris denique corporis animique molestiis magis magisque acuitur. Iam vero augustum Eucharistiae Sacramentum, beatitatis et gloriae causa idem et pignus est, idque non animo tantum sed etiam corpori. Quum enim animos caelestium bonorum copia locupletat, tum iis perfundit suavissimis gaudiis, quae quamlibet hominum aestimationem et spem longe superent; in adversis rebus sustentat, in virtutis certamine confirmat, in vitam custodit sempiternam, ad eamque tamquam instructo viatico perducit. Corpori autem caduco et fluxo Hostia illa divina futuram ingenerat resurrectionem; siquidem corpus immortale Christi semen inserit immortalitatis, quod aliquando erumpat. Utrumque istud et animo et corpori bonum inde obventurum Ecclesia omni tempore docuit, Christo obsecuta affirmanti: "Qui manducat meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam: et ego resuscitabo eum in novissimo die." (Ioann. vi., 55.)—Cum re cohaeret magnique interest id considerare,

ex Eucharistia, quippe quae a Christo instituta sit tamquam "passionis suae memoriale perenne" (S. Thomas aquin. Opusc. lvii. Offic. de festo Corp. Christi),christiano homini castigandi salutariter sui denunciari necessitatem. Iesus enim primis illis sacerdotibus suis: "Hoc facite, inquit, in meam commemorationem" (Luc. xxii., 19), idest hoc facite ad commemorandos dolores, aegritudines, angores meos, meam in cruce mortem. Quapropter huiusmodi sacramentum idem et sacrificium assidua est in omne tempus poenitentiae, ac maximi cuiusque laboris adhortatio, itemque voluptatum, quas homines impudentissimi tantopere laudant et efferunt, gravis et severa improbatio: "Quotiescumque manducabitis panem hunc, et calicem bibetis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis donec veniat." (I. Cor. xi., 26.)

Praeter haec, si in praesentium malorum causas diligenter inquiras, ea reperies inde fluxisse, quod hominum inter ipsos caritas, caritate adversus Deum frigescente, deferbuerit. Dei se esse filios atque in Iesu Christo fratres obliti sunt; nihil, nisi sua quisque, curant; aliena non modo negligunt, sed saepe oppugnant in eaque invadunt. Inde crebrae inter civium ordines turbae et contentiones: arrogantia, asperitas, fraudes in potentioribus; in tenuioribus miseriae, invidiae, secessiones. Quibus quidem malis frustra a providentia legum, a poenarum metu, a consiliis humanae prudentiae quaeritur sanatio. Illud est curandum enitendumque, quod plus semel Ipsi fusiusque commonuimus, ut civium ordines mutua inter se concilientur officiorum coniunctione, quae a Deo profecta, opera edat germanum Iesu Christi spiritum et caritatem referentia. Hanc terris Christus intulit, hac omnia inflammari voluit, utpote quae una posset non modo animae sed etiam corpori beatitatis aliquid vel in praesens afferre: amorem enim immoderatum sui in homine compescit et divitiarum cohibet cupiditatem, quae "radix omnium malorum est." (I. Tim. vi., 10.) Quamquam vero rectum est omnes iustitiae partes inter ordines civium convenienter tutari; praecipuo tamen caritatis praesidio et temperamento id demum assequi licebit ut in hominum societate salutaris ea quam Paulus suadebat, "fiat aequalitas" (II. Cor. viii., 14), facta conservetur. Hoc igitur Christus voluit, quum augustum hoc Sacramentum institueret, excitanda caritate in Deum, mutuam inter homines fovere caritatem. Haec enim ex illa, ut perspicuum est, suapte natura existit, et sua veluti sponte effunditur: neque vero fieri potest ut ulla ex parte desideretur, quin immo incendatur et vigeat oportet, si Christi erga ipsos caritatem perpendant in hoc Sacramento; in quo, ut potentiam suam et sapientiam magnifice patefecit, sic "divitias divini sui erga homines amoris velut effudit." (Conc. Trid. sess. xxi., De Euchar. c. ii.) Tam insigni ab exemplo Christi, omnia sua nobis largientis, sane

quantum ipsi inter nos amare atque adiuvare debemus, fraterna necessitudine quotidie arctius devincti! Adde quod vel signa ipsa, quibus huiusmodi constat Sacramentum, peropportuna coniunctionis incitamenta sunt. Qua de re sanctus Cyprianus: "Denique unanimitatem christianam firma sibi atque inseparabili caritate connexam etiam ipsa dominica sacrificia declarant. Nam quando Dominus corpus suum panem vocat de multorum granorum adunatione congestum, populum nostrum quem portabat indicat adunatum: et quando sanguinem suum vinum appellat de botris atque acinis plurimis expressum atque in unum coactum, gregem item nostrum significat commixtione adunatae multitudinis copulatum." (Ep. 69, ad Magnum n. 5 [al. 6.]) Similiter Angelicus Doctor ex Augustini sententia (Tract. xxvi., in Ioann. n. 13, 17) haec habet: "Dominus noster corpus et sanguinem suum in eis rebus commendavit, quae ad unum aliquid rediguntur ex multis; namque aliud, scilicet panis ex multis granis in unum constat, aliud, scilicet vinum in unum ex multis acinis confluit; et ideo Augustinus alibi dicit: O Sacramentum pietatis, o signum unitatis, o vinculum caritatis." (Summa theol. iii. p. q. lxxix., a. 1.) Quae omnia confirmantur Concilii Tridentini sententia, Christum Eucharistiam Ecclesiae reliquisse "tamquam symbolum eius unitatis et caritatis, qua Christianos omnes inter se coniunctos et copulatos esse voluit . . . symbolum unius illius corporis, cuius ipse caput exsistit, cuique nos, tamquam membra, arctissima fidei, spei et caritatis connexione adstrictos esse voluit." (Sess. xiii., De Euchar. c. ii.) Idque edixerat Paulus: "Quoniam unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus, omnesque de uno pane participamus." (I. Cor. x., 17.) Illud enimvero pulcherrimum ac periucundum est christianae fraternitatis aequalitatisque socialis specimen, promiscue ad sacra altaria circumfundi patritium et popularem, divitem et pauperem, doctum et indoctum, eiusdem aeque participes convivii caelestis.—Quod si merito in Ecclesiae fastis hoc primordiis eius vertitur propriae laudi quod "multitudinis credentium erat cor unum et anima una" (Act. iv., 32); sane eos tam eximium bonum debuisse consuetudini mensae divinae, obscurum non est; de ipsis enim commemoratum legimus: "Erant perseverantes in doctrina Apostolorum et in communicatione fractionis panis." (Act. ii., 42.)—Mutuae praeterea inter vivos caritatis gratia, cui a Sacramento eucharistico tantum accedit roboris et incrementi, Sacrificii praesertim virtute ad omnes permanat qui in sanctorum communione numerantur. Nihil est enim aliud sanctorum communio, quod nemo ignorat, nisi mutua auxilii, expiationis, precum, beneficiorum communicatio inter fideles vel caelesti patria potitos vel igni piaculari addictos vel adhuc in terris peregrinantes, in unam coalescentes civitatem, cuius caput Christus, cuius forma

caritas. Hoc autem fide est ratum, etsi soli Deo Sacrificium augustum offerri liceat, tamen etiam honori Sanctorum in caelis cum Deo regnantium, *qui illos coronavit*, celebrari posse ad eorum patrocinium nobis conciliandum atque etiam, ut ab Apostolis traditum, ad labes fratrum abolendas, qui iam in Domino mortui, nondum plane sint expiati.—Sincera igitur caritas quae, in salutem utilitatesque omnium, omnia facere et pati assuevit, prosilit nempe ardetque actuosa ex sanctissima Eucharistia, ubi Christus adest ipse vivus, ubi suo erga nos amori vel maxime indulget divinaeque impulsus caritatis impetu suum perpetuo sacrificium instaurat. Ita facile apparet undenam hominum apostolicorum ardui labores, unde tam multae variaeque apud catholicos institutae benemerendi de humana familia rationes sua ducant auspicia, vires, constantiam, felicesque exitus.

Haec pauca quidem in re perampla minime dubitamus quin abunde frugifera christiano gregi accidant, si opera vestra, Venerabiles Fratres, sint opportune exposita et commendata. At vero tam magnum et virtute omni affluens Sacramentum nemo satis unquam, proinde ac dignum est, nec eloquendo laudaverit, nec venerando coluerit. Ipsum sive pie mediteris, sive rite adores, sive eo magis, pure sancteque percipias, tamquam centrum existimandum est in quo christiana vita, quanta usquam est, insistit; ceteri quicumque habentur, pietatis modi demum in id ipsum conducunt et desinunt. Atque ea Christi benigna invitatio benigniorque promissio: "Venite ad me omnes, qui laboratis, et onerati estis, et ego reficiam vos" (Matth. xi., 28), in hoc praecipue mysterio evenit et quotidie impletur.—Ipsum denique est velut anima Ecclesiae, ad quod ipsa sacerdotalis gratiae amplitudo per varios ordinum gradus dirigitur. Indidemque haurit habetque Ecclesia omnem virtutem suam et gloriam, omnia divinorum charismatum ornamenta, bona omnia: quae propterea summam curarum in eo collocat ut fidelium animos ad intimam cum Christo coniunctionem per Sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis eius instruat et adducat: ob eamque rem caeremoniis sanctissimis ipsum ornando facit venerabilius.—Perpetuam hoc etiam in genere providentiam Ecclesiae matris ea praeclarius commendat hortatio, quae in sacro Tridentino Concilio edita est, mirificam quamdam caritatem pietatemque redolens, plane digna quam populus christianus a Nobis accipiat ex integro revocatam: "Paterno affectu admonet Sancta Synodus, hortatur, rogat et obsecrat per viscera misericordiae Dei nostri, ut omnes et singuli, qui christiano nomine censentur, in hoc unitatis signo, in hoc vinculo caritatis, in hoc concordiae symbolo iam tandem aliquando conveniant et concordent, memoresque tantae maiestatis, et tam eximii amoris Iesu Christi Domini nostri qui dilectam animam suam in nostrae salutis pretium, et carnem suam nobis dedit ad manducan-

dum, haec sacra mysteria corporis et sanguinis eius ea fidei constantia et firmitate, ea animi devotione ac pietate et cultu credant et venerentur, ut panem illum supersubstantialem frequenter suscipere possint, et is vere eis sit animae vita et perpetua sanitas mentis; cuius vigore confortati, ex huius miserae peregrinationis itinere ad caelestem patriam pervenire valeant, eumdem panem Angelorum, quem modo sub sacris velaminibus edunt, absque ullo velamine manducaturi." (Sess. xiii., de Euchar. c. viii.)—Porro testis historia est, christianae vitae cultum vulgo floruisse melius, quibus temporibus esset Eucharistiae perceptio frequentior. Contra non minus est exploratum consuevisse, ut quum caelestem panem negligerent homines et veluti fastidirent, sensim elanguesceret christianae professionis vigor. Qui quidem ne prorsus aliquando deficeret, opportune cavit in Concilio Lateranensi Innocentius III., quum gravissime praecepit, ut minimum per solemnia Paschalis nemo christianus a communione Dominici Corporis abstineret. Liquet vero praeceptum huiusmodi aegre datum, ac postremi remedii loco: semper enim id fuit Ecclesiae in votis, ut cuique sacro adessent fideles de divina hac mensa participes. "Optaret sacrosancta Synodus ut in singulis Missis fideles adstantes non solum spirituali affectu, sed sacramentali etiam Eucharistiae perceptione communicarent, quo ad eos sanctissimi huius sacrificii fructus uberior proveniret." (Conc. Trid. sess. xxii., c. vi.)

Et uberrimam quidem salutis copiam non singulis modo sed universis hominibus paratam hoc habet augustissimum mysterium, ut est Sacrificium: ab Ecclesia propterea *pro totius mundi salute* assidue offerri solitum. Cuius sacrificii, communibus piorum studiis, fieri ampliorem cum existimatione cultum addecet; hac aetate vel maxime, oportet. Itaque multiplices ipsius virtutes sive latius cognosci sive attentius recoli velimus.—Principia lumine ipso naturae perspicua illa sunt: supremum esse absolutumque in homines, privatim publice, Dei creatoris et conservatoris imperium; quidquid sumus quidquid privatim publiceque habemus boni, id omne a divina largitate profectum: vicissimque a nobis Deo testandam et summam, ut Domino reverentiam, et maximam, ut beneficentissimo, gratiam. Haec tamen officia quotusquisque hodie invenitur, qui qua par est religione colat et observet! Contumaces in Deum spiritus haec, si unquam alia, prae se fert aetas: in qua rursus invalescit adversus Christum ea vox nefaria: "Nolumus hunc regnare super nos" (Luc. xix., 14), nefariumque propositum, "Eradamus eum" (Ier. xi., 19), nec sane quidquam tam vehementi impetu complures urgent, quam ut ex civili atque adeo ex humana omni consortione pulsum segregent Deum. Quo conscleratae dementiae quamquam usquequaque non proceditur, miserabile tamen est quam multos teneat divinae

Maiestatis beneficiorumque eius, partae praesertim a Christo salutis, oblivio. Iamvero hanc tantam vel nequitiam vel socordiam sarciat oportet auctior communis pietatis ardor in cultu Sacrificii eucharistici; quo nihil Deo esse honorabilius, nihil iucundius potest. Nam divina est, quae immolatur hostia; per ipsam igitur tantum augustae Trinitati tribuimus honoris, quantum dignitas eius immensa postulat; infinitum quoque et pretio et suavitate munus exhibemus Patri Unigenitum suum; eo fit ut benignitati eius non modo agamus gratiam, sed plane referamus.—Duplicemque alium ex tanto sacrificio insignem fructum licet et necesse est colligere. Maeret animus reputando, quae flagitiorum colluvies, neglecto, ut diximus, contemptoque Dei numine, usquequaque inundaverit. Omnino humanum genus magnam partem videtur caelestem iram devocare: quamquam ipsa illa quae insidet, malarum rerum seges, continet iustae animadversionis maturitatem. Excitanda igitur in hoc etiam pia fidelium contentio, ut et vindicem scelerum placare Deum, et auxiliorum eius opportunitatem calamitoso saeculo conciliare studeant. Haec autem videant maxime huius ope Sacrificii esse quaerenda. Nam divinae tum iustitiae rationibus satis cumulateque facere, tum clementia large impetrare munera possunt homines sola obitae a Christo mortis virtute. Sed hanc ipsam virtutem sive ad expiandum, sive ad exorandum voluit Christus integram permanere in Eucharistia, quae mortis ipsius non inanis quaedam nudaque commemoratio, sed vera et mirabilis, quamquam incruenta et mystica, renovatio est.

Ceterum, non mediocri Nos laetitia afficimur, libet enim profiteri, quod proximis hisce annis fidelium animi ad amorem atque obsequium erga Eucharistiae Sacramentum renovari coepisse videantur; quod quidem in spem Nos erigit temporum rerumque meliorum. Multa enim id genus et varia, ut initio diximus, sollers induxit pietas, sodalitates praesertim vel eucharisticorum rituum splendori amplificando, vel sacramento augusto dies noctesque assidue venerando, vel illatis eidem contumeliis iniuriisque sarciendis. In his tamen acquiescere, Venerabiles Fratres, neque Nobis licet neque vobis; etenim multo plura vel provehenda restant vel suscipienda, ut munus hoc omnium divinissimum apud eos ipsos, qui christianae religionis colunt officia, ampliore in luce atque honore versetur, tantumque mysterium quam dignissima veneratione colatur. Quapropter suscepta opera acrius in dies urgenda; prisca instituta, sicubi exoleverint, revocanda, ut sodalitia eucharistica, supplicationes Sacramento augusto ad adorandum proposito, sollemnes eius circumductae pompae, piae ad divina tabernacula salutationes, alia eiusdem generis et sancta et saluberrima; omnia praeterea aggredienda, quae prudentia et pietas ad rem suadeat. Sed in eo prae-

cipue est elaborandum, ut frequens Eucharistiae usus, apud catholicas gentes late reviviscat. Id monent nascentis Ecclesiae, quae supra memoravimus, exempla, id Conciliorum decreta, id auctoritas Patrum et sanctissimorum ex omni aetate virorum; ut enim corpus, ita animus cibo saepe indiget suo; alimoniam autem maxime vitalem praebet sacrosancta Eucharistia. Itaque praeiudicatae adversantium opiniones, inanes multorum timores, speciosae abstinendi causae penitus tollendae; ea enim agitur res, qua nihil fideli populo utilius tum ad redimendum tempus e sollicitis rerum mortalium curis, tum ad christianos revocandos spiritus constanterque retinendos. Huc sane magno erunt momento praestantiorum ordinum hortationes et exempla, maximo autem cleri navitas et industria. Sacerdotes enim, quibus Christus Redemptor Corporis et Sanguinis sui mysteria conficiendi ac dispensandi tradidit munus, nihil profecto melius pro summo accepto honore queant rependere, quam ut Ipsius eucharisticam gloriam omni ope provehant, optatisque sacratissimi Cordis eius obsequendo, animos hominum ad salutiferos tanti Sacramenti Sacrificiique fontes invitent ac pertrahant.

Ita fiat, quod vehementer cupimus, ut praecellentes Eucharistiae fructus quotidie uberiores proveniant, fide, spe, caritate, omni denique christiana virtute, feliciter accrescente; idque in sanationem atque emolumentum rei quoque publicae; fiat, ut providentissimae Dei caritatis magis magisque eluceant consilia, qui tale mysterium *pro mundi vita* constituit perpetuum.

Quarum Nos rerum erecti spe, Venerabiles Fratres, auspicem munerum divinorum caritatisque Nostrae testem, Apostolicam benedictionem et singulis vobis et vestro cuiusque clero ac populo peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die xxviii. Maii, in praeludio sollemnitatis Corporis Christi, anno MDCCCCII., Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo quinto.

Leo PP. XIII.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE LEO XIII.

THE MOST HOLY EUCHARIST.

LEO XIII., POPE.

To the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops and other Ordinaries in peace and communion with the Apostolic See.

VENERABLE BRETHREN,

Health and Apostolic Benediction:

THE wonderful zeal for the salvation of men of which Jesus Christ has given us so bright an example we, in accordance with the sanctity of our office, strive to study and imitate unceasingly, and, with His help, we shall continue to follow the same Divine model as long as life remains in us. As it is our lot to live in times bitterly hostile to truth and justice, we have endeavored to supply abundantly as far as lay in our power, by teaching, admonishing and working, whatsoever might seem likely to avert the contagion of error in its various forms or strengthen the energies of Christian life. In this connection there are two things within the memory of the faithful, intimately connecting one with the other, the accomplishment of which fills us with consolation in the midst of so many sorrows. One is that we declared it most desirable that the whole human race should be consecrated in a special manner to the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ the Redeemer; the other that we most earnestly exhorted all bearing the Christian name to adhere steadfastly to Him who by divine authority is for all men the Way, the Truth and the Life.

And now, in truth, watching with vigilance over the fortunes of the Church in these evil days, we are impelled by the same apostolic love to add something which will crown and finish the project we had in mind; namely, to recommend to the Christian world by a special act of our authority the Most Holy Eucharist.

The Blessed Eucharist is the most divine gift, given to us clearly from the inmost heart of the Redeemer, with the desire of one desiring this singuar union with man and instituted chiefly for the generous disposal of the fruits of His redemption. In this matter we have hitherto manifested by our authority and zeal not a little solicitude. And it is pleasant to remember, among other things,

that we, by legitimate approval and privileges, largely increased the number of institutes and sodalities devoted to the perpetual adoration of the Divine Host; that we also took care to have Eucharistic congresses held with suitable splendor and corresponding usefulness, and that we made patron of those and similar works, the heavenly Paschal Baylon, who stood out in his day as a most devout worshiper of the Eucharistic mystery.

Therefore, venerable brethren, it is well to fix our minds on certain features of this mystery in defending and illustrating which the zeal of the Church has constantly been manifested and not infrequently crowned by the palm of martyrdom, whilst the doctrine itself has called forth the learning and eloquence of the greatest men and the most noble masterpieces in various arts. Here it will be our duty to point out clearly and expressly the power that is in this mystery to cure the evils and meet the necessities of the present age. And surely, as Christ, at the close of His mortal life, left this sacrament as the great monument of His love for men, as the greatest support "for the life of the world" (St. John vi., 52), so we, who are likewise soon to depart, can desire nothing more eagerly than to excite and nourish in the minds of all men feelings of grateful love and religious devotion towards this most wonderful sacrament, in which, we believe, are to be found the hope and assurance of salvation and peace.

It may be a cause of surprise to some that we should think this age, so universally disturbed and groaning under so great a burden, should be best aided by such remedies and helps, and persons shall not be wanting, perhaps, who will treat our utterances with fastidious indifference. This comes chiefly from pride, and pride is a vice which weakens Christian faith and produces such a terrible darkness about divine things that of many it is said: "Whatever things they know not, they blaspheme." (Judea x.) But so far are we from being averted from the purpose we have in view that we believe more firmly than ever that it will bring light to those who are well disposed and obtain, by the brotherly intercession of the devout, pardon from God for those who revile holy things.

To know with full and perfect faith what is the virtue of the Most Holy Eucharist is to know what God, made Man, accomplished for the salvation of the human race in His infinite mercy. For as it is a duty of true faith to proclaim our belief in Christ and worship the Supreme Author of our salvation, who by His wisdom, laws, example and the shedding of His blood renewed all things, it is a duty of equal obligation to worship Him who is really present in the Eucharist, that so He may abide among men to the end of the world, and by the perennial communication of Himself make them sharers in the blessings of His redemption.

Now, he who studiously and religiously considers the blessings flowing from the Holy Eucharist sees at once that in it are contained in the most eminent degree all other blessings of every kind; for from it that life flows which is truly life: "The bread which I will give is My flesh for the life of the world." Not in one way alone is Christ the life—Christ, who assigned as the cause of His coming among men that He might bring them a sure fullness of life that was more than human: "I come that they may have life, and have it more abundantly." For as soon as "the goodness and compassion of God our Saviour" appeared upon earth, a power at once came forth that almost created a new order of things and influenced every department of civil and domestic society. Thence new relations between man and man; new rights, public and private; new duties; a new direction given to institutions, laws, arts and sciences. The thoughts and studies of men were drawn towards the truth of religion and the sanctity of morals, and hence a life given to men truly heavenly and divine. All this is frequently commemorated in the sacred writings; the tree of life, the word of life, the book of life, the crown of life, and, expressly, the bread of life.

But this life about which we are speaking bears an express resemblance to the natural life of men, and so, just as the one is nourished by food and grows strong, so does the other likewise require to be supported and strengthened by food. And here it is well to recall the time and manner in which Christ moved the minds of men and excited them to receive suitably and righteously the living bread which He was about to give them. For where the fame had spread abroad of the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves which He had wrought on the shore of Tiberias, many people followed Him so that their hunger, too, might be appeased. Then Jesus, seizing the opportunity, just as when He infused into the Samaritan woman at the well a thirst for the water "springing up into life everlasting," similarly disposes the minds of the eager multitude to desire more eagerly another bread, the bread "which endureth unto life everlasting." But this bread, as Jesus continues to show, is not that heavenly manna given to their fathers wandering through the desert, nor is it that which they themselves had lately received from Him in astonishment; but He Himself is the true bread which He gives: "I am the bread of life." He inculcates still further the same lesson both by council and by precept: "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is My flesh for the life of the world." And the gravity of the command He thus shows clearly: "Amen, amen, I say unto you: Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you." Away, therefore, with that common and most pernicious

error of those who believe that the Holy Eucharist is only for those who, free from business and troubled in mind, resolve to seek repose in some design of a more religious life. For the Holy Eucharist, than which there is nothing more excellent or salutary, is for all, whatsoever their employment or dignity, who wish (and there is no one who should not wish) to nourish in themselves the life of Divine Grace, of which the ultimate end is the attainment of life eternal.

Would that those whose genius or industry or authority could do so much to guide the men and affairs of the age would think rightly of eternal life and impart the knowledge of it to others. But, alas! we see with regret that most of these arrogantly believe that they have given to the world a life prosperous and almost new, because they urge it forward to strive in its excited course for utilitarian objects and the mere gratification of curiosity. Look where you will, human society, alien though it is from God, far from enjoying that tranquillity of affairs which it seeks, labors in great anguish and trepidation like one tossing in a fever; it strives vainly to obtain that prosperity in which alone it puts its trust, ever vainly pursuing it and clinging desperately to what is slipping from its grasp. For men and states come necessarily from God, and therefore in no other can they live or move or do good but in God through Jesus Christ, from whom men have received and still receive the best and choicest gifts. But the chief source and fountain head of all these gifts is the Holy Eucharist, which, while it nourishes and supports that life for which we strive so ardently, exalts in the highest degree that dignity of human nature which seems to be so highly valued in these days. For what can be greater or more desirable than to be made as far as possible participators and partners in the Divine nature? But this is what Christ does in the Eucharist, raising man up to divine things by the aid of grace and uniting Himself to him by bonds so close. For there is this difference between the food of the body and the food of the soul, that the former is converted into us, but the latter converts us into itself, and it is to this that Augustine refers when he puts the words into the mouth of Christ: "You shall not change Me into thee as food of thy flesh, but thou shalt be changed into Me."

But this most excellent sacrament, which renders men participators of the Divine nature, also enables the soul of man to advance in every class of the higher virtues. And first in faith. At all times faith has had its assailants; for although it exalts the minds of men with knowledge of the most lofty things, yet, while it has revealed that there exist things above nature, it conceals their precise character, and so seems to depress the human mind. Formerly only this or that article of faith was attacked; afterwards war was waged much more widely, until it finally came to be affirmed that there was

nothing at all above nature. Now, for renewing in the mind the vigor and fervor of faith there is nothing more suitable than the mystery of the Eucharist, which is properly called the mystery of faith; for truly in this one mystery, by reason of its wonderful abundance and variety of miracles, is contained the whole supernatural order. "He has made a remembrance of His wonderful works, being a merciful and gracious Lord. He hath given food to them that fear Him." For if God acknowledged what He wrought above nature as due to the incarnation of the word, through whom the salvation of the human race was restored, according to that word of the Apostle: "He hath purposed . . . to reëstablish all things in Christ, that are in heaven and on earth, in Him;" the Eucharist, according to the testimony of the Holy Fathers, is a continuation and an expansion of the incarnation. For by it the substance of the incarnate word is united to men, and the supreme sacrifice of Calvary is renewed in a manner that is full of mystery. This the prophet Malachy signified in the words: "In every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean oblation." And this miracle, the greatest of all, is accompanied by innumerable others, for here all the laws of nature are suspended; the whole substance of the bread and wine is changed into the Body and Blood of Christ; the species of bread and wine are sustained without a subject by Divine power; the Body of Christ dwells at the same time in as many places as the sacrament is consecrated. But human reason is enabled the better to reverence so great a mystery by the prodigies which have been performed in its glory in past ages and in our own days, of which, indeed, there still exist renowned and public proofs, and that not in one place merely. We see, therefore, that by this sacrament faith is fostered, the soul nourished, the falsehoods of rationalists dissipated and the whole order of the supernatural made clear to our eyes.

But it is not pride alone, but depravity of mind as well, that makes faith in Divine things grow weak. For if it happens that the better the morals the clearer the intelligence, if even the prudence of the Gentiles perceived that the mind is blunted by the pleasures of the body, as Divine wisdom has already borne testimony, then so much more in Divine things do the pleasures of the body obscure the light of faith, and even extinguish it altogether in God's just punishment. And for these pleasures there is burning in those days an insatiable cupidity, a cupidity which, like the contagion of disease, widely infects all even from their first tender years. There is a remedy for this terrible evil in the Divine Eucharist. For, first of all, by increasing charity it checks voluptuous desire; as Augustine says: "The nourishment (of charity) is the lessening of lust; perfection, no lust."

Besides, the most chaste flesh of Jesus restrains the luxury of our flesh, as Cyril of Alexandria has said: "For Christ existing in us calms the law of the flesh raging in our members." But even more the peculiar and most precious fruit of the Eucharist is that signified in the saying of the prophet: "What is the good thing of Him (Christ), and what is His beautiful thing but the corn of the elect, and wine springing forth virgins?"—namely, the strong and constant resolve of sacred virginity, which, while the age slips away in pleasures, flourishes in the Catholic Church more widely and more fruitfully from day to day, and, indeed, what a great advantage and ornament this is everywhere to religion and even to ordinary human intercourse is well known. Moreover, this sacrament strengthens beyond conception the hope of immortal blessings and the confidence of Divine aid. For the desire of happiness which is in the minds of all is more and more sharpened and strengthened by the emptiness of all earthly goods, by the unjust violence of wicked men and by all the other troubles of mind and body.

Now the august Sacrament of the Eucharist is at once the cause and pledge of happiness and glory not only for the soul, but also for the body. For while it enriches the soul with an abundance of heavenly gifts, it also fills it with joys so sweet that they far surpass every thought and hope of man; in adversity it sustains; in strife of virtue it confirms; it leads to everlasting life as by an open pathway. But to the frail and perishable body that Divine Host gives a future resurrection, for the immortal Body of Christ implants the seed of immortality which is some time to bud forth. This advantage, both to soul and body, the Church has at all times taught, following Christ, who said: "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath everlasting life; and I will raise him up on the last day." And here it is of great importance to consider that the Eucharist, being instituted by Christ as a "perennial memorial of His passion," declares to all Christian men the necessity of mortifying themselves. For Jesus said to His first priests: "Do this for a commemoration of Me," that is, do this to commemorate My sorrows, griefs, tortures and death on the cross. Hence this sacrament, which is also a sacrifice, is a ceaseless exhortation, for all time, to penance and every spiritual effort; it is also a solemn and severe reproof of those pleasures which shameless men praise and exalt so highly: "As often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come."

Moreover, if you diligently examine into the causes of the present evils, you will find that they arise from the fact that the charity of men towards one another has grown faint according as the love of God grew cold. They have forgotten that they were sons of God

and brothers in Jesus Christ; they think of nothing but themselves; the rights of others they not only disregard, but attack and invade. Hence the frequent quarrels and contentions among the various classes of citizens; the arrogance, harshness, dishonesty among the more powerful; the misery, envy and spirit of revolt among the weaker. For these evils it is vain to seek a remedy from the enactments of law, the fear of punishment or the plans of human prudence. What must be aimed at, as we ourselves have more than once recommended, is to reconcile the various orders of citizens by a mutual union of duties, a union which would come from God and give birth to works stamped with the true spirit and charity of Christ. This union Christ brought upon earth; by it He wished all things to be inspired, as being the one thing that could bring some happiness, even in the present, not only to the soul, but also to the body, restraining as it does man's immoderate love of himself, and repressing the passion for riches, which is "the root of all evils."

But although it is necessary that all just rights should be well protected, it is nevertheless lawful to establish and preserve in society that salutary "equality" which St. Paul recommended. This, therefore, is what Christ wished in instituting this august sacrament—to excite love toward God and to foster charity among men. For the one flows, as is evident, of its very nature and almost spontaneously, from the other; nor can men live without it at all; nay, it must even burn and flourish in their hearts, if they consider the charity of Christ towards them in this sacrament, in which He has maintained His marvelous power and wisdom, and also "poured forth the riches of His divine love for men." And as Christ has given us such an example of love, how we should love and help each other, bound together as we are still more closely by the needs of our common brotherhood! Moreover, the outward symbols of this sacrament are in a special manner calculated to incite us to union. For St. Cyprian says: "The very sacrifices of redemption themselves proclaim the necessity of Christian concord in the firm and inseparable bonds of charity. For when the Lord calls His body bread which is made up of the union of many grains, He indicates the union of that people whose sins He bore; and when He calls His blood wine which is drawn from many ripe grapes, again He signifies a flock made one by the union of the multitude." Similarly the Angelic Doctor following St. Augustine says: "Our Lord commended His body and blood in those things which are moulded in unity; for the first, the bread, namely, is made one from many grains, and the other, the wine, also becomes one from many grapes." And therefore Augustine elsewhere says: "O Sacrament of piety, O sign of unity, O bond of charity."

All this is confirmed by the declaration of the Council of Trent, that Christ left the Eucharist to the Church "as a symbol of that union and love with which He wished all Christians to be bound together—a symbol of that body of which He is head, and to which He wished us to be united as members by the most firm bonds of faith and hope and charity." And this St. Paul himself had declared: "For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread." Yes, truly, here is a most beautiful example of Christian brotherhood and of social equality, that all should approach the same altars without distinction; the nobility and the people, the rich and the poor, the learned and the unlearned, are equally sharers in the same heavenly banquet. And if it has been the glory of the Church that, in the first ages, "the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul," it cannot be doubted that such a wonderful blessing was due to the custom of approaching the holy table; for of them we find it recorded, "And they were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread." Moreover, the grace of mutual charity among the living, so much strengthened and increased as it is by the Sacrament of the Eucharist, flows out unto all who are in the communion of saints particularly through the power of the Holy Sacrifice. For the communion of saints, as all know, is nothing else than the mutual communication of aid, expiation, prayer and benefits among the faithful, whether in heaven or enduring the expiatory fires of Purgatory, or still abiding upon earth, but all forming one state, whose head is Christ, and whose life-giving principle is love. It is also a matter of faith that while to God alone the Holy Sacrifice may be offered, yet it can also be celebrated in honor of the saints reigning in heaven with God "Who crowned them," to obtain their patronage and protection, and also to blot out the stains of the brethren who had died in the Lord, but who had not yet made full atonement. That true charity, therefore, which is wont to do and endure all things for the salvation and utility of all, leaps and burns into life from the Most Holy Eucharist, in which Christ is really present, in which He gives way to His love for us in the highest form, and under the impulse of His divine love, perpetually renews His sacrifice. It is from this that the arduous labors of apostolic men, as well as the various institutions that have had their origin among Catholics and deserve so well of the human race, derive their influence, strength, constancy and successful results.

These few things written by us on a great subject will, we doubt not, produce much fruit if you, venerable brethren, seasonably expound and commend them to the faithful.

At the same time this sacrament is so great and so abounding in

virtue that no one has ever yet adequately praised it by his eloquence or worshiped it by his adoration. Whether you meditate upon it or rightly worship it, or better still, purely and worthily receive it, it is to be regarded as the great centre round which turns the whole Christian life; to it all other forms of piety lead; in it they end. In the self-same mystery that gracious invitation and still more gracious promise of Christ: "Come to Me all you that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you," are renewed and daily fulfilled. Lastly, it is, as it were, the soul of the Church, towards which is directed the fulness of sacerdotal grace through the various grades of orders. From the very same source does the Church draw all her power and glory, all the ornaments of her Divine ritual, and all the efficacy of her blessings. Therefore, she takes the greatest care to instruct the faithful and lead them to this intimate union with Christ by the Sacrament of His Body and Blood; and for the same reason she adorns it and makes it more worthy of reverence by means of the most sacred ceremonies. The constant care of our Holy Mother the Church in this matter is summed up in the exhortation of the Council of Trent; an exhortation breathing forth wonderful charity and piety, and worthy of being entirely recalled again by us to the Christian world: "With paternal affection the Holy Synod admonishes, exhorts, demands and, by the bowels of God's mercy, entreats all, without exception, who are called Christians, to sometimes meet and find peace in this sign of unity, in this bond of charity, in this symbol of concord; to be mindful of that immense majesty and of that wonderful love of Jesus Christ, our Lord, who gave His life as price of our salvation, and His flesh to be our food; to believe and venerate those sacred mysteries of His Body and Blood with such constancy and firmness of faith, such devotion of mind and piety and zeal, that they may be able to frequently receive that supersubstantial bread, so that He may be truly to them the life of their soul and the perpetual health of their mind, and thus that strengthened by its vigor, they may be able, after the journey of this miserable exile, to reach their heavenly country and eat without any veil upon their eyes the very same bread of angels which they now eat concealed under the sacred species."

Now, history bears witness that Christian life flourished better in the times when the reception of the Blessed Eucharist was more frequent. On the other hand, it is not less certain that when men began to neglect and almost despise this heavenly bread the vigor of the Christian profession sensibly diminished. Lest it should some time pass away altogether, Innocent III., in the Council of Lateran, imposed the most solemn precept that, at the very least, no Christian should abstain at Paschal time from receiving the Body of the

Lord. This precept, however, was imposed with reluctance, and, it is clear, only as the last remedy; for it has been always the wish of the Church that the faithful should approach the holy table at every sacrifice. "The most Holy Synod would wish the faithful attending each Mass to communicate not only spiritually, but even sacramentally, so that they might receive more abundantly the fruits of the sacrifice."

And this most sacred mystery contains as a sacrifice the plenitude of salvation not only for individuals, but for all men; hence the Church is accustomed to offer it unceasingly "for the salvation of the whole world." It is fitting, therefore, that by the common zeal of the devout there should be greater love and esteem for this sacrifice; in this age particularly there is no more pressing necessity. Accordingly, we desire that its efficacy and power should be remembered more widely and even more diligently proclaimed. Principles evident from the very light of reason tell us that God, the creator and preserver of all things, has a supreme and absolute dominion over men, both privately and publicly; that all that we have and are in every sphere has come from His bounty; and that we, in turn, are bound to give Him the highest reverence as our Master and the greatest gratitude as our most generous benefactor. And yet how few are there to-day who fulfil those duties with suitable piety.

This age, if any, surely manifests the spirit of rebellion against God; in it that impious cry against Christ again grows strong: "We will not have this man to reign over us," and that impious resolve, "Let us cut Him off." Nor, indeed, is anything urged more vehemently by very many than this, that they should banish and separate God from all intercourse with men. This criminal madness is not universal, we joyfully admit; yet it is lamentable how many have forgotten the Divine Majesty and His benefits, and the salvation that was obtained chiefly through Christ. Now, this wickedness and folly must be resisted by an increase of general devotion and zeal in the worship of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Nothing could of itself be more full of sweetness and consolation to the Christian soul. For the Victim that is immolated is Divine, and, accordingly, the honor that we render through it to the Holy Trinity is in proportion to its infinite dignity; we offer also to the Father His only-begotten Son—an offering that is infinite in value and infinitely acceptable; hence it is that we not only give Him thanks for His goodness, but even make Him a return. There is also another twofold and wonderful fruit which may and ought to be derived from this great sacrifice.

The mind grows sad when it reflects on the fearful multitude of

crimes which abounds on all sides, God, as we have said, being neglected and the Divine Majesty despised. The human race in great part seems to call upon the Divine anger, although indeed that harvest of evil which has been reaped contains in itself the ripeness of a just punishment. The zeal of the faithful should be roused to appease God, the avenging Judge of crime, and obtain from Him the reform of a sinful age. This is to be done chiefly by the aid of this holy sacrifice. For it is by virtue alone of Christ's death that men can fully satisfy the demand of Divine justice, and abundantly obtain mercy and pardon. But this power of expiation or of entreaty Christ wished to remain wholly in the Eucharist, which is not a mere commemoration of His death, but a real and wonderful, although unbloody and mystic, renewal of it.

At the same time let us confess we have not a little joy knowing that in those last years the minds of the faithful seem to have been renewed in love and reverence for the Sacrament of the Eucharist; and this gives us a better hope for the future. For, as we said in the beginning, ingenious piety has done much in this direction, especially in sodalities, either by increasing the splendor of our Eucharistic rites, or worshiping the Holy Sacrament constantly by day and night, and making atonement for the insults and injuries it receives. But, venerable brethren, it is not lawful for us or for you to stop here; for yet many more things remain to be done or undertaken, so that this, the most Divine work of all, may be put in a clearer light and held in greater honor among those who practice the duties of the Christian religion, that so great a mystery may be honored in a manner worthy of its greatness. Hence the works that have been undertaken are to be urged on more vigorously from day to day; old institutions, where they have disappeared, are to be renewed, as, for example, the Sodalities of the Eucharist, the supplications poured forth to the holy sacrament exposed for adoration, all the solemnity of pomp with which it was surrounded, the pious salutations before the tabernacles, and other holy and most profitable practices of the same nature; in fine, everything is to be done that prudence and piety could dictate. But, above all, endeavor should be made to revive widely again among Catholic nations the frequent use of the Holy Eucharist. To this the example of the early Church, the decrees of councils, the authority of the fathers and of the holy men in every age exhort us; for as the body needs its own food, so does the soul, and the most life-giving nourishment is given by the Holy Eucharist. Therefore, condemn beforehand the opinions of those who oppose such frequent communions. Banish the idle fears of many and the spacious excuses or reasons for abstaining from the Body of the Lord; for nothing could be more effective in rescuing

the world from its anxiety about perishable things, and in bringing back and perpetually preserving the Christian spirit. Here the exhortations and examples of the higher orders, and still more the zeal and industry of the clergy, will be of great value. For priests to whom Christ, the Redeemer, has given the office of consecrating and administering the mysteries of His Body and Blood, can surely make no greater return for the high honor they have received than to do all in their power to promote His glory in the Eucharist, and by following the desire of His Most Sacred Heart to invite and draw the souls of all to the saving fountains of so great a sacrament and sacrifice.

Thus may the surpassing fruits of the Eucharist become, as we ardently desire, more fruitful from day to day, with abundant growth, also, in faith, hope, charity, and in every virtue; may this revival of piety tend to the peace and advantage of the State, and may the designs of God's most provident love in instituting such a perpetual mystery for the life of the world be made manifest to all men.

Buoyed up with such a hope, venerable brethren, and as a pledge of Divine gifts as well as of our affection, we lovingly impart to each one of you, and to your clergy and people, our Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, near St. Peter's, on this 23d day of May, on the approach of the solemnity of Corpus Christi, in the year 1902, the twenty-fifth of our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., POPE.

THE LAST WORDS OF AN AGNOSTIC.

THE parting words of Mr. Herbert Spencer to a world which he so long undertook to lead and guide could not possibly be without interest. "Facts and Comments"—his latest and "last" work—will, it is true, hardly enhance its author's fame. It is not a learned, or a profound, or a very thoughtful work. It is even lacking in rhetorical interest—usually a pleasing feature in Mr. Spencer's writings, even when his logic lagged. It treats of all manner of subjects from metaphysics to music. It is so filled with the frivolous musings of age, the puerilities, the drivel, the important trifles and chatter of failing powers, that it is but too suggestive of Dogberry's wisdom, "A good old man, sir; he will be talking: as they say, when the age is in the wit is out." Indeed, two famous agnostics have already written each a volume too many; George Eliot her "Impressions of Theophrastus Such," and Herbert Spencer his "Facts and Comments."

And yet the volume is not without its value. Indeed, in some respects it is the most important work which Mr. Spencer has given to the world; for it proclaims in unmistakable language the utter failure of all the teachings for which the name of Mr. Spencer has stood for more than half a century.

Few men have ever set themselves so stupendous a task as that which Mr. Herbert Spencer selected as his life work. He was one of the four men who, in the English-speaking world, began, about the middle of the last century, the vast work of reconstructing human thought. He is now the sole survivor. In the opinion of Messrs. Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley and Spencer, the time had come for a successful revolt against established beliefs. The nineteenth century was in its full noonday splendor. The sciences were at the zenith of their glory. Why then should the opinions of a far-off age be allowed to cloud the brilliancy of an ever-brightening day? Why should primitive beliefs, which, as Professor Huxley said, "should be fossil but were not" be permitted to stalk abroad in open day in an age so gorgeously illuminated with the light of new and advancing science? Why should Jewish lawgivers, and Chaldean sages, and Hebrew prophets and teachers of a bygone age, influence an era that had discovered steam and electricity, and converted our supposed vast globe into a mere toy for infancy? Surely an age which had accomplished so much could well undertake to solve anew for itself the riddle of the universe and fling all the old notions upon this point to the winds of heaven. Let the old sphinx then beware. A new race of men now stood before her. Her riddle which had defied

all the ages and baffled all the prophets must at last yield to the science and the sages of the nineteenth century. The makeshift of revelation and divine interference was to be wholly eliminated. All supernaturalism must be rigidly excluded. Science and human intellect were quite competent and would solve the riddle of existence. A new epoch—the epoch of science and enlightenment—was to be ushered in, and the new heavens and the new earth of scientific glory and enlightenment were to be fashioned and established on the ruins of the old. The work, it is true, was a gigantic one. It meant the entire recasting of all human opinion, the reconstruction of all human thought, the coördination of all knowledge, the unification of all beliefs. The scope was far-reaching. It included everything from suns to microbes. It extended to every crevice of matter and every fold of mind. It meant the creation of new worlds to take the place of those that were to be cast aside as worthless. Science, philosophy, morality, religion—all must be created anew. And then there were the realms of biology, and psychology, and sociology, and politics—all states within states—which must be reconstructed so that each may revolve perfectly in its own sphere and be securely fixed on its own axes. Above all, man must be taught anew—and without interference or interposition on the part of supramundane powers. The new knowledge was to make us all as gods; and "the new wine of science," as it had been happily styled, was to intoxicate mankind with a happiness of which the hace had never even dreamed.

It were indeed a stolid race that could be indifferent to the results from such wondrous promise, and Mr. Herbert Spencer has conveniently summarized for us these important results. Mr. Spencer is himself "the last of the Romans." He has given us what he says is his "last" volume. He has been, moreover, the living embodiment of the whole movement. All the others were mere specialists. Mr. Spencer, however, took all knowledge to be his portion. He took the threads from every department of learning, held them firmly in his hand and undertook to weave them all into a warp and woof which would give us the true answer to the sphinx's riddle. No one then is so capable of giving us an estimate of the success of the movement as Mr. Spencer himself. No one will be inclined to question views on this point emanating from such a source. And fortunately Mr. Spencer has been candid and explicit.

Mr. Spencer and his colleagues had also learned a lesson from the failure of the eighteenth century revolt against revelation and supernaturalism. They were just the men to profit by the experience of that age of failure. The cause of the failure in the preceding cycle was manifestly that the movement offered no substitute for the creed

it would supplant. The scientific movement of the nineteenth century was sure to guard against this error of the eighteenth. The old nail of revealed religion must be driven out with the new nail of science. In science and philosophy former doctrines were to be superseded by the famous theory of evolution; in religion the superstitions of revelation by the new cult of agnosticism. With these substitutes for obsolete philosophies and religions there was little danger of a repetition of the mistakes of the preceding century.

Whether by accident, by arrangement, or by choice, to Mr. Spencer fell the gigantic task of fashioning the new theories. He was, as Darwin had early styled him, the "great philosopher" of the movement. His task it was to grasp the mighty whole within his capacious intellect; to arrange all the facts, to collate, to compare, to coördinate the entire mass of human experience; and from out the vast variety to bring unity and harmony. To vary the metaphor, his task was to fuse all the facts, all the experience, and all the knowledge of all time in one molten mass, fashion it all in one common mould, and thus from the fused mass, fashion the new image of truth. This was Mr. Spencer's task and his alone. Darwin was a specialist whose range did not go beyond organic matter and who labored in the interests of one hobby—natural selection. Tyndall was also a specialist, engaged upon his experiments in light and heat and diamagnetism, and could offer little more than his sympathy and his narrow specialty of science to the work of the great synthesis. Huxley was an ardent and enthusiastic *collaborateur*, it is true. His judgment was valuable. His criticisms were usually keen and sound. As a platform exponent of the new theory he was indeed unsurpassed. But he contributed nothing to the work itself beyond a valuable suggestion now and then; and while his judgments always carried weight, the planning of the vast architectonics of the system with all its various ramifications was the work of Mr. Spencer, the philosopher of evolution and agnosticism. For over half a century he has labored at his mighty task; now we have his own estimate of how much he has accomplished.

How important was the great synthesis of human knowledge which Mr. Spencer undertook, admitted of no question. The magnitude of the undertaking, its vast scope and extent, were duly proclaimed. The world was gravely informed at the outset that Mr. Spencer's "discussions strike down to the profoundest basis of human thought, and involve the deepest questions upon which the intellect of man has entered." It was told that his work not only contained "the prime requisites of the highest education," but also "*a knowledge of the truths which it is most important for man to know.*" The truths furnished by Mr.

Spencer's labors were expected "*to determine correct rules of human action, the principles of private and public justice, and to form a theory of right living.*" These were certainly ambitious aims, and most men would shrink from the task. But Mr. Spencer believed that he had a special mission to enlighten the world, and he never hesitated or faltered. He himself assures us of the "greatness of the question at issue." He realized that the matter was "one which concerns each and all of us more than any other matter whatever." His conclusions, he warned us, must at least indirectly "affect us in all our relations—must determine our conception of the Universe, of Life, of Human Nature—*must influence our ideas of right and wrong, and so modify our conduct.*" Of course such a vast undertaking "must cause a revolution of thought," but this revolution would be "*fruitful in beneficial consequences,*" and consequently "must surely be worth the effort." These were sanguine hopes, and it is worth while to inquire whether Mr. Spencer has reaped their full realization.

One would suppose that a life of such usefulness should pass into the great beyond with unrippled calmness and serenity; that spent in the solution of the world's problems its last days would be brightened by the knowledge it had given to the world and the light it had thrown on these great subjects. What could be more beautiful or more encouraging to the followers of Mr. Spencer and to the whole agnostic world than to behold the bark of their leader and founder glide gently over the surface of the smooth and tranquil deep leaving a sheen of golden glory in its track—the result of the new light which he had shed upon the great problems among which he spent a lifetime? One might, indeed, expect mighty and far-reaching results from a work so big with promise. But alas! in the history of futile endeavor there is nothing sadder than the figure of Mr. Spencer in his old days groping for light on the very questions which he set out to solve and in the very places which he resolutely ignored in life. No one will deny to the agnostic his dying consolations if we may judge by those of the father and founder of the cult. Here is the wail of a dying life without hope, without joy. There is not in all the world anything more dreary, more doleful, more disconsolate. After telling us that

> "For years past, when watching the unfolding buds in the spring there has arisen the thought: Shall I ever again see the buds unfold? Shall I ever again be awakened at dawn by the song of the thrush?"

he tells us that out of the folds and recesses of consciousness come other and deeper questions—questions which the "great philosopher" has failed to solve. They come now to haunt him like ghosts, and their persistency increases with advancing age. It would be a great mistake to suppose that a great philosopher who

so jauntily undertook to read the riddle of human life and solve the problems of the universe for all the rest of mankind, who dismissed with a sneer all other solutions of the mystery except that which he himself might give, and who rejected so cavalierly all former views about the first beginning and last end of all things—regarding them as unworthy of consideration—goes down to his grave in untroubled peace and quiet regarding those questions which he so resolutely excluded as illegitimate and unknowable during life, or which undertook to solve anew. Not so. Great philosophers, it appears, have their hopes and fears like lesser men; and it would seem that the great questions of the after life thrust themselves back upon such with a vengeance for being excluded in life from consideration. Mr. Spencer thus answers for himself:

"Now that the end is not likely to be long postponed, there results an increasing tendency to *meditate upon ultimate questions.*"

Nor is this peculiar to Mr. Spencer alone. He possesses it in common with all agnostics. He says:

"It is commonly supposed that those who have relinquished the creed of Christendom occupy themselves exclusively with material activities—thinking nothing of the How and the Why, of the Whence and the Whither."

But no such thing. There are the great and greatly abused questions lying in wait for them at the gates of death.

"It may be so," he says, "with many of the uncultured. In the minds of those intimately known to me the riddle of existence fills spaces far larger than the current conception fills in the minds of men in general."

But why are these questions still a conundrum to Mr. Spencer? Are they not precisely the problems which he set out to solve for the world? Have we not just seen that when "First Principles" was first given to the world it was prefaced with the information that it was to "strike down to the profoundest basis of human thought," that it was to deal with "the deepest questions upon which the intellect of man has entered," and that moreover it was to furnish "a knowledge of the truths which it is most important for man to know?" Can it be that such magnificent promises are to fall short of fulfilment? Nay; did not Mr. Spencer himself unhesitatingly tell us that his vast work was to deal with problems which concern "each and all of us more than any other matter whatever?" Did he not inform us that it would "affect us in all our relations?" Did he not assure us that it would, nay, "*must* determine our conception of the Universe, of Life, of Human Nature" (all of them, too, capitalized), and that it even would and "*must* influence our ideas of right and wrong?" What then means this "increasing tendency to meditate on ultimate questions?" What means this language about the "riddle of existence?" Has not Mr. Spencer solved those questions for

us? Was not this the scope and end of his work? Can it be possible that he has failed to answer them satisfactorily? And can it be that Mr. Spencer—at the end of life—is still seeking for answers to questions which he started out to solve once and forever for the rest of mankind?

But alas! the truth must be confessed. Upon these all-important questions it is, with the agnostic at last—question, perplexity, doubt; and doubt, perplexity, question. Indeed there is not in history so striking or instructive a tableau as that of Mr. Spencer, the "great philosopher" of evolution and the great founder of agnosticism, at the end of life with the volume "Hell Opened to Christians" in his hands, seeking in the despised and discarded creed answers to the questions which he spent his life in solving and which nevertheless continue to perplex his last days. Not Prometheus with the vulture pecking at his liver; not Job seated in his royal misery upon a dunghill; not the Prodigal vainly trying to suck life's sustenance from the discarded husks, presents a sadder picture than the "great philosopher" endeavoring in vain to find answers to his questions in the very effervessence of the creed which he so long despised. It seems like another instance of the irony of fate. Of course it would be strange if Mr. Spencer should find the clamors in his mind appeased by the volume he has in hand; for the simple reason that he cannot understand it. He has spent his life in ignoring and depreciating the value of the fundamental doctrines on which the volume is based, to be able now to grasp the meaning of the work.

But in no quarter, search as he may, is the father of agnosticism successful in finding an answer to his riddle. He looks up to heaven; it is not there. He looks to earth; it is not there. He looks to the uttermost bounds of the universe; in vain. He scrutinizes his evolution, he searches his metaphysics and his agnosticism; but there is no answer. He looks to the world of consciousness within him; only silence reigns there. He inquires of the world around him; he finds only the futility of his inquiry as his answer.

"Concerning the outer world," he muses, "as concerning the inner world, those who have not satisfied themselves with traditional explanations, continually have thrust upon them the same questions—trite questions concerning the origin, meaning and purpose alike of the Universe as a whole and of all its living contents, down to the microscopic forms of which earth, air and water are full. On the agnostic these questions are continually forced; and continually he sees the futility of all efforts to find consistent answers to them."

This is indeed singular language from one who with unhesitating confidence informed the world over half a century ago that he had already found "consistent answers" to these questions. The "deep-

est questions" of the human intellect were to be made as the pages of an open book. The whole world was to be furnished—without money and without price—with a full "knowledge of the truths which it is most important for man to know." Even the ignorant and wayfaring man was to have determined for him—without danger of error—a proper "conception of the Universe, of Life, of Human Nature." What then, in the name of all the agnostic philosophers, and in the name of all the evolutional scientists, means Mr. Spencer's present language about "questions concerning the origin, meaning and purpose of the Universe," which "are continually forced on the agnostic," and "the futility" of answering which, he "sees continually?" Mr. Spencer seems to be wholly unmindful of the bow of promise which he set in the agnostic heavens more than fifty years ago, when the doubtful were told by the great agnostic philosopher that the rough ways of knowledge were at last to be made smooth and the crooked straight and plain. Is it not strange that the teachers who have been teaching the world for over half a century, who were to give us a synthesis of thought and a unification of knowledge, should now be asking for answers to the questions which they themselves undertook to solve for mankind? Nothing can show more conclusively the utter worthlessness of agnosticism with its loud boasts and hollow pretensions than the spectacle of its great founder, philosopher, and prophet whining for answers to his own questions at the end of life. But the external world fails to respond to Mr. Spencer's cries for light; and so does the internal.

Regarding the question of existence after death Mr. Spencer's perplexity amounts to a positive dilemma. His musings on this point are amusing, even if doleful. Believing as he does—with his entire school—that consciousness is nothing more than a brain function, the difficulty of the answer is for him insuperable. To those who build philosophy on principles instead of on will-o'-the-wisp experiment the question presents the ordinary metaphysical difficulty. To the agnostic, however, who insists that he should eat his cake and have it too; or what is the same thing, who wants the brain to continue its functions even after death—and will accept no other testimony in the matter—the answer becomes a metaphysical impossibility. Accordingly, finding that he can get no evidence of consciousness without the activity of the brain, Mr. Spencer says he is "obliged to relinquish the thought that consciousness continues after physical organization becomes inactive."

We are not here trying to refute Mr. Spencer. We are simply wondering at his strange perplexities, and the still stranger snares in which men who are wiser than the rest of the world have the faculty of enmeshing themselves. The agnostic finds himself com-

pelled to relinquish the idea of an after life because the dead brain cannot give him any testimony of a thinking principle continued after dispensing with the agency of its material servant. And yet his mind rebels against this conclusion:

"But it seems a strange and repugnant conclusion," he says, "that with the cessation of consciousness at death there ceases to be any knowledge of having existed."

And thus he is perplexed and ill at ease on this question of questions. There is not in all the world a sadder spectacle than to see the old age of a once brilliant youth, wrinkled, shrivelled, and shrunken, like a withered leaf, seated with fixed and hopeless gaze on the problems it fain would solve, searching wistfully for a spark of warmth among the ash heaps of the world, and straining the fast-dimming eyes in every direction for one single ray of light and hope. And then the gloom and hopeless despair which settles down upon the anxious seeker when he finds that on the door of agnosticism are written the words: "All hope abandon you who enter here;" and when in woe-begone accents he murmurs to himself with Mr. Spencer: "With his last breath it becomes to each the same thing as though he had never lived." The only inference Mr. Spencer can draw from his own crude guesses is that the individual man at death "lapses into the Infinite and Eternal whence they were derived." We are but bubbles, then, on the surface of the great river and sink back again into its bosom, and are henceforth as if we had never been.

But even these views he broaches with doubt, dread and uncertainty. Had the aged prophet of agnosticism borne his conclusions with equanimity and fortitude, had he clung tenaciously to his own views of life, had he been steadfast to the end in his rejection of current beliefs, had he been consistent even in his wretched negations, or had he remained firm in his doubt and unwavering in his denial, there might have been at least some example of constancy left to his followers. But tossed about on the treacherous billows of human fancy he has not been able to point out a single meaning in man's existence. He fails utterly to find a purpose or end in life. He has not left to the world one single uplifting or ennobling thought, not a page or a word that might enhance man's dignity in his own eyes. He thinks that man's days are but as grass and quite as profitless—yet even of this he is not certain—and he now ignominiously returns at the end of life to seek some light in views and opinions which he spent a lifetime in deriding. He now busies himself in searching for answers to questions which he had hoped to be able to answer off-hand, or which he said were not worthy of consideration.

But if those questions are important at the end of life, why are

they not important also during life? If important during life, why did Mr. Spencer ignore them? Why were they so persistently kept in the background? And if they were important and Mr. Spencer undertook to answer them, why does he not now give the world his answer? And why, above all, does he present to the world the spectacle of old age groping and seeking for knowledge in the creeds he labored so hard to villify and discredit during life? Surely it was when his intellect was at high noon that he should have examined the merits of the answers which he so disdainfully rejected and which he now seems disposed to reconsider.

But if the founder of agnosticism has failed to find a meaning and purpose in human life as well as in the universe, his failure on this point must be regarded as success when compared with the result of his efforts in the region of morals. Here was the realm in which Mr. Spencer had hoped to reap the rich harvest of all his labors. After all, what did it matter whether he solved the sphinx's riddle, provided he could serve humanity by giving it a proper basis for its morality! Of the need and importance of a new foundation for the moral world Mr. Spencer was thoroughly convinced. We shall best understand what has been the extent of the failure or success of his efforts in the moral sphere by comparing his present opinions on the subject with the sanguine views which spurred him on to his extensive labors in this particular domain. It will be remembered that Mr. Spencer sketched for himself a precise programme in his collossal work of coördinating human thought and unifying human knowledge. The order of this programme was to be strictly followed in his work, for in the agnostic heaven as well as in our own, order is the first law; hence Mr. Spencer's orderly programme might not be deviated from easily. Nevertheless there was a deviation—but let Mr. Spencer himself give his justification of it. In his preface to "The Data of Ethics," apologizing to the world for the interruption of his elaborate programme, he said:

"A reference to the programme of the 'System of Synthetic Philosophy' will show that the chapters herewith issued constitute the first division of the work on the 'Principles of Morality,' with which the system ends. As the second and third volumes of the 'Principles of Sociology' are as yet unpublished, this instalment of the succeeding work appears out of its place."

This interruption of his programme and inversion of its order he thus explains and justifies:

"I have been led thus to deviate from the order originally set down by the fear that persistence in conforming to it might result in leaving the final work of the series unexecuted. Hints, repeated of late years with increasing frequency and distinctness, have shown me that health may permanently fail, even if life does not end, before I reach the last part of the task I have marked out for myself."

To avert such a calamity, then, which would so disastrously affect the mass of mankind, Mr. Spencer paused in the middle of

his all-important programme, and seeing the possibility that he might not live to finish it, he, with great forethought and commendable regard for the world at large, resolved to forestall any such public calamity by then and there publishing the volume of his works, which, as being the most important, he had reserved for the last. So much at least would be preserved for the world. How momentous was this crisis for the world he proceeds to tell us:

"This last part of the task it is, to which I regard all the preceding parts as subsidiary. Written as far back as 1842, my first essay . . . vaguely indicated what I conceive to be certain general principles of right and wrong in political conduct; and from that time onwards *my ultimate purpose, lying beyond all proximate purposes, has been that of finding for the principles of right and wrong in conduct at large, a scientific basis.*"

What wonder, indeed, that he reversed his programme since it was a question of finding a new basis of morality! This then was the goal of all his colossal labors—his "ultimate purpose, lying beyond all proximate purposes." Every one will sympathize with him when he says:

"To leave this purpose unfulfilled after making so extensive a preparation for fulfilling it, would be a failure the probability of which I do not like to contemplate; and I am anxious to preclude it, if not wholly, still partially. Hence the step I now take."

Who will not say that Mr. Spencer, considering the gravity of the matter, was not justified in taking this momentous step? But this was not all. There was something more at stake than the fulfilment of a purpose—"ultimate" though that purpose was. There were still more grave—and even imperative—reasons why Mr. Spencer's views on the question of morality should be then given to the world. The good of mankind was at stake. The Sinaitic code stood in sore need of supplementary aid. The moral world was trembling in the balance—and Mr. Spencer saw it. But let him speak for himself:

"I am the more anxious to intimate in outline, if I cannot complete, this final work, because the establishment of rules of right conduct on a scientific basis is a pressing need. *Now that moral injunctions are losing the authority given by their supposed sacred origin, the secularization of morals is becoming imperative. Few things can happen more disastrous than the decay and death of a regulative system no longer fit, before another and fitter regulative system has grown up to replace it.*"

At this momentous crisis, it was in the highest degree pihlanthropic in Mr. Spencer to throw himself into the breach and save mankind. The carrying out of a set programme was not for a moment to be weighed against the importance of meeting the danger from the upheaval of the moral world. And fortunate it was that at the critical moment a new Moses was at hand who should ascend the Sinai of science and give a new code of morals to mankind. Indeed it is to be feared that the world at large does not realize its debt to Mr. Spencer upon this special point, and that in some quarters his services to humanity are altogether ignored. But be that as it may,

Mr. Spencer could not sit idly by, and behold the oncoming disaster without doing all that in him lay to avert it. In the gap left by the disappearance of the divine commandments something must be placed to prevent a universal collapse. The founder of agnosticism saw the overwhelming danger fast approaching. He grasped its full significance. And he alone understood the remedy. Indeed there is nothing in the whole history of agnosticism or evolution so majestically noble, so sublimely heroic, as the sight of this new Atlas rushing in to sustain upon his shoulders the entire moral sphere and thus save it from falling into the bottomless abyss. Here are his noble words while girding himself so heroically for the task:

"As the change which promises or threatens to bring about this state . . . is rapidly progressing, those who believe that the vacuum (in the moral world) can be filled, and that it must be filled, are called upon to do something in pursuance of this belief."

Here, then, was the hour; and fortunately here, too, was the man. The new code of morality was given to the world forthwith. The breach was filled. The moral world was saved. The timely rescue of morality has passed into history, there to take its place forever. This interruption of his programme occurred in the year 1879. During the twenty-three years which have since elapsed the illustrious Moses of agnosticism has had ample opportunity to calculate the inestimable value of his immortal achievement. Fortunately the forebodings regarding health and life have proved untrue. The agnostic chief succeeded in combating disease and bribing death, and has had the satisfaction of living to see the completion of the programme so graciously and magnanimously interrupted. Fortunately he has also lived to give us his own estimate in retrospect of the work which was so momentous and magnificent even in anticipation.

The establishment of a new morality on a scientific or secular basis, then, was the chief aim and end of all the great labors of the great founder of agnosticism. This was his "ultimate purpose"—"lying beyond all proximate purposes." It was to be the crowning, "the final work of the series," and he had intended, at first, to reserve it to the end as the grand finial and completion. To this "all the preceding parts" of his immense programme were merely "subsidiary." So important did he deem it that when there seemed danger that it might not be accomplished, Mr. Spencer, like the merchant who flings all his rich merchandize overboard to save his vessel, was ready to sacrifice all else of his works that this might be saved. There was a crisis in the moral world that rendered the work "imperative." It was a "pressing need." There was a "vacuum" in the world which must needs be filled. The "disappearance of the code of supernatural ethics" left "a gap" which must be filled by a

"code of natural ethics." The "decay and death of a regulative system no longer fit" was at hand. Nothing but "disaster" could follow —unless, indeed, the disaster could be averted by preparing "another and fitter regulative system to replace it." Such, in Mr. Spencer's own phrase, was the gravity of the crisis in which the great leader acted so promptly. Such the worthlessness of the old system of Christian morality. Such the importance, the necessity, the fitness and adequacy of the new system by which Mr. Spencer actually replaced it. Such the immortal services of Mr. Spencer to mankind. Now we well may ask:

"But what good came of it at last?"
Quoth little Peterkin.

Fortunately on this point Mr. Spencer is clear and explicit. After twenty-three years of trial it is interesting to learn Mr. Spencer's own views on the work accomplished.

Alas! Here, too, the high hopes and excellent intentions with which Mr. Spencer inaugurated his new moral code are, it seems, far from fulfilment. His ideals are far indeed from realization. Squarely he puts the question:

"To one who has relinquished the creed of his fathers there comes from time to time the question, What shall I say to those who believe as of old?"

Of course, judging from what we have seen of Mr. Spencer's views of the old and new questions, there should be but one answer—prompt, precise and incisive. It is with something of a shock, then, that we hear his reply:

"To answer is difficult, since the reasons for and against this or that line of conduct are many and variable."

When we recall the episode of a reversed "programme," the "pressing need," the "vacuum" to be filled, the "fitter regulative system," the duty that was so "imperative," and so forth, with which the new morality was introduced, we can hardly believe our senses, and we hasten on for something to show the redemption of Mr. Spencer's magnificent pledge to mankind in questions moral. The tone, however, continues disappointing and the language still wavering and shuffling. He continues:

"In many cases the Agnostic is misled by the assumption that a secular creed may with advantage forthwith replace the creed distinguished as sacred."

"Misled!" The agnostic "misled!" And by the supposition that the Christian creed may be advantageously replaced by the creed of evolution; the Christian morality by the secular morality! Surely this cannot be Herbert Spencer that speaks. This cannot possibly be the language of the founder and prophet of agnosticism. There

must be a mistake somewhere. It surely cannot be that the new morality has proved a failure—a mistake. For what then was the programme interrupted? For what purpose did Mr. Spencer fling himself so valiantly into the breach? To what end did he undertake the Atlantean task of supporting on his own shoulders the entire moral sphere? For what was the world duly admonished of the approaching "disaster," of the inevitable "decay and death" of the Christian system which was "no longer fit?" And what of that "other and fitter regulative system" of morals, if now it prove that the agnostic was merely "misled" by vain assumptions? But in plain words Mr. Spencer declares that he himself was deceived and that he deceived his agnostic following by vain imaginings. His language is unmistakable:

"That right guidance may be furnished by a system of natural ethics," he says, "is a belief usually followed by the corollary that it needs only to develop such a system and the required self-control will result. *But calm contemplation of men's natures and doings dissipates this corollary.*"

Verily this is a strange sequel to the famous preface. "Calm contemplation" and a little experience "dissipate" all Mr. Spencer's fair fancies. His most sanguine hopes he finds dashed to pieces. His fair utopia of a scientific and secularized morality is but a vanished dream. The new morality is a complete delusion. Mr. Spencer's eyes are at last open to the true condition of things—at least to the failure of his own moral patents. In the interval of twenty-three years he has discovered (better late than never) that with some men, as he tells us, "dogmatic teaching is alone effective." He has at last begun to see —what was long patent to all the world besides—that "the hope that average men may be swayed by the contemplation of advantage to society is utterly utopian." It has at last begun to dawn upon his intellect that the sociological incentive to morality is but a mere chimera; while of natural or secularized ethics he at last perceives that "The Agnostic who thinks he can provide forthwith adequate guidance by setting forth a natural code of right conduct, duly illustrated, *is under an illusion.*"

There is no mistaking this language; but this is not all. Stranger still than all this is the extraordinary announcement that the agnostic morality will not "injure" the average man—and *may* benefit him. Here is what he tells us in grave and solemn earnest:

"So that ill-grounded as may be the Agnostic's hope that a system of natural ethics will at once yield good guidance, it must not be inferred that endeavors to substitute such a system for the supernatural system with its penalties and rewards, will injure the average of men—may indeed benefit them, by showing that agreement between the naturally derived sanctions and most of those supposed to be supernaturally derived."

Shades of Aristotle and Plato, of Seneca and Cato! Has natural ethics at last come to this? Is it at length true that the best that can

be said of secular morality is that it will not hurt, and that it *may* help men to be moral? Surely if this be the sum and substance of all its merits Mr. Spencer need not have been to the trouble of interrupting and inverting his programme. Indeed there is great danger that all his exalted heroism in filling up the breach will be robbed of much of its sublimity. But this is not the only singular feature of this remarkable statement. Mr. Spencer plainly states in the passage just quoted that the only thing which prevents the agnostic morality from being positively injurious in many cases, and renders it beneficial—if, haply, beneficial it be (he is not certain)—is that the new ethics happens, fortunately, to have some points of agreement with the old. Later he makes the most extraordinary announcement of all. It is that there are many instances in which "nothing but evil can follow" the introduction of the new morality! To understand fully the real force of this latter statement—which, by the way, is a perfectly true one—it is merely necessary to imagine the same thing predicated of Christian morality. Here then in the two last passages quoted from Mr. Spencer we have four distinct statements regarding the agnostic ethics. First, that they will not injure the average man. Secondly, that they may even benefit him. Thirdly, whether they fail to injure or result in benefiting him, it is because of their points of agreement with Christian morality. And fourthly, there are cases in which they would prove positively injurious—"nothing but evil" would follow their introduction. This is certainly a most extraordinary recommendation for the agnostic morality; yet in some quarters it seems to be accepted as eminently satisfactory. To the world at large it will be the strongest proof that agnostic morality is false and all its claims spurious. Nothing can show more clearly the sham pretensions of a principle supposed to be general than to discover that it is not applicable in all cases. This is preëminently true of a system of morals. What, for instance, can be more absurd than to imagine a rule of right and wrong that cannot be applied to all classes of men? One might suppose that right was right and wrong wrong independent of individuals or communities. In the agnostic world, however, this does not seem to hold good. Indeed the fact is that the speculative scientists—the evolutionists especially—have become so accustomed to juggle with truth that their minds seem to be blunted to the perception of what is in reality truth. They are grown so accustomed to taking half facts of science for whole, to regarding false hypotheses and baseless assumptions as legitimate conclusions; so content to call half truths, shreds of truth, and often entire falsities, by the name of truth; that their minds seem to be wholly vitiated and they are no longer able to distinguish truth from falsehood. The sharp dividing line between

truth and error seems to be, for their intellects at least, wholly obliterated, and like the liar who at last, it is said, comes to believe his own falsehoods, they have lost the perception of the difference between truth and error. And thus the leaven of falsehood has been introduced into all modern teaching. This is, probably, why Mr. Spencer and his agnostic followers fail to see the glaring enormity of the following statement, and pass it over as if the easy flexibility of agnostic morality were a virtue in it. He says:

"And there are many who stagger on under the exhausting burden of daily duties, fulfilled without thanks and without sympathy, who are enabled to bear their ills by the conviction that after this life will come a life free from pains and weariness. *Nothing but evil can follow a change in the creed of such;* and unless cruelly thoughtless the agnostic will carefully shun discussion of religious subjects with them."

Surely here is matter for a May morning. "Nothing but evil can follow the change" from the Christian creed to the agnostic no-creed, and even to suggest such a change would be cruel thoughtlessness. What then is the use of the new morality? If a rule of morals be good for anything it must be good for every one. If it possess truth—without which it would be worse than worthless—there can be no harm in applying it freely. No evil should follow. Truth and goodness are twin sisters; so are falsehood and evil. The tree is known by its fruit. It is not truth but error the teaching of which "nothing but evil can follow." If Mr. Spencer then has found at last that his moral nostrums are worthless and in some cases injurious, does he not know that this very fact brands his agnostic ethics as false and spurious? Why then does he attempt to foist them upon the world? Why not candidly and manfully confess them to be absolutely worthless? Why keep up a pretence that the new morality may have some value?

And yet it is, perhaps, not to be wondered at that Mr. Spencer should still delude himself with the notion that after all his agnostic morality may be good for something. His labors during a long life have been colossal—even if they have been folly. The crown of all these labors was to be the code of ethics. All his efforts in every other direction he has candidly admitted to be failure. It is doubtless difficult to admit—even to himself—that here there is failure also; to say with Othello:

> But there, where I have garnered up my heart,
> Where either I must live, or bear no life,
> The fountain from the which my current runs
> Or else dries up to be discarded thence;

to find his final hopes shattered, and nought but deceit and disappointment await him where once was radiant hope—this doubtless leads him still to cling to illusion. And illusion it must be when his concluding words are:

"Meanwhile, sympathy commands silence towards all who, suffering under the

ills of life, derive comfort from their creed. While it forbids the dropping of hints that may shake their faith, it suggests the evasion of questions which cannot be discussed without unsettling their hopes."

Perhaps never in the history of all the assaults of unbelief upon the Christian creed has there been anything broached so monstrous as this pernicious doctrine. Where is the agnostic's regard for truth? If the agnostic has any truth to tell upon these important points, by all means let him tell it though the heavens fall. What is to be gained by withholding the facts—if facts they be? If there be no hope of future reward, is it not the worst kind of cruelty to mock men with the delusion that there is? Why not undeceive the believer if the agnostic knows that his faith and hope are false? Possibly those from whom you are withholding the knowledge—if knowledge it be—may easily take a short cut to earthly happiness which even the agnostic has not dreamed of. Why not give him an opportunity of enjoying even the Nirvana of Buddhism or the opium heaven of the Chinese? By all means let the truth be told at all costs. Sham sentiment and mock kindness can never justify the suppression of a general truth, and especially a moral one.

Time was when Mr. Spencer set his face like flint against all tergiversation, prevarication and evasion. Let Mr. Spencer carry out to the very end the excellent intentions with which he set out in "First Principles." If he has discovered any "ultimate truth" let him avow it with "absolute sincerity—with not the most remote mental reservation." Let him assert it "with all possible emphasis." Let there—as he then promised—not be "any makeshift way" nor any "compromise." Why does Mr. Spencer play false now to those noble resolves? The fact is, however, that with all its boasts and bravado agnosticism is a coward and a deceiver. It has not the courage of even its negative convictions. It has merely deep doubt as to the tenability of its own position. As was inevitable, agnosticism has, in doubt of itself, at last turned upon itself, and is skeptical and agnostic even about its own merits.

But these are not the only points on which Mr. Spencer's efforts have resulted in utter failure. There has been failure all along the whole line of his labors. As all the world knows, he has utterly repudiated the great doctrine of the "survival of the fittest"—the great corner-stone of evolution—which he himself expressly invented as a more catching phrase than Darwin's "natural selection," and which until a little over a decade ago he preached vigorously in season and out of season. In "Facts and Comments" he reiterates his rejection of this his former favorite principle, and lest at the end of life there might be any doubts remaining, he tells us once more that "there is no inductive proof whatever of natural selection;" that "of the effects of artificial selection the evidence is overwhelming,

but of the effects of natural selection none is forthcoming;" and that moreover "until the production of one species by natural selection is shown, there is not even the beginning of an inductive proof." Inferentially, too, he shows once more the failure of his new substitute for the survival of the fittest—"the use-inheritance" of Lamarck. If there be such a thing as damning with faint praise, there is also such a thing as damning a doctrine with faint proofs. And this Mr. Spencer does when, contrasting the merits of natural selection or survival of the fittest with those of use-inheritance, he tells us that for the former "there is not even the beginning of an inductive proof," and that "on the other hand inductive proof of the use-inheritance doctrine is not *wholly* wanting." At the same time he fully admits that his own famous objection to a personal God —such as it is—has full force against his theory of use-inheritance. He does not deny that it is impossible to "conceive any means" by which the process is carried on. And thus as far at least as Mr. Spencer is concerned the doctrine of evolution is left without a leg to stand on.

It would extend this article to undue lengths to give a complete exposition of Mr. Spencer's further failure as the founder of the agnostic creed. A few general outlines must suffice. Whatever may be the claims of others, to Mr. Spencer is undoubtedly due the conception of agnosticism. The creed—if creed it can be called whose greatest boast is the impossibility of a creed—of agnosticism is based upon one single principle—false, of course—namely, that conceivability should be the sole test of truth. And to Mr. Spencer is fully due the credit—such as it is—of discovering this famous principle. It was upon it he based his doctrine of the unknowable; and the unknowable is the god of agnosticism. What we cannot conceive we cannot know. What we cannot know, of course, we cannot know. Conceivability, then, is the test of truth and the unknowable must remain unknown to the end of all reckoning. Therefore what we cannot conceive mentally must be put out of court altogether. What we cannot form an adequate conception of must be eliminated from controversy. It can form no part of knowledge.

This famous principle—without which agnosticism would be impossible—has been exposed in all its naked absurdity over and over again. It has been proved many times that it leads to atheism in religion, to nihilism in philosophy, and to nescience in science. All our science being merely the science of appearances and shadows, it follows that if we deal with the substance which underlies all appearances—the being which is behind all the show and shadow—the noumenon is which is back of all phenomena—the Infinite without which we cannot have the finite—the necessary without which there

can be no contingent existence—if we deal with all this as a negative, we can have no knowledge whatever. For we cannot know the appearances except inasmuch as they are related to the underlying substance. Hence the absurdity of all Mr. Spencer's philosophy in his "First Principles." So intent, however, was Mr. Spencer on the work of excluding the unknowable from all recognition that he was blind to the absurdity of his ridiculous position. He believed that his principle would apply to the unknowable and to the unknowable alone. He never dreamed that it could be applied equally well to much that he valued as knowledge. He would not listen to any warning words. Now he has discovered that this famous principle applies to matters of which he never dreamed, that it enters into all his science and all his philosophy, that it confronts him in every path of inquiry and every domain of knowledge, that the barriers which with so much labor he opposed to the supernatural will exclude much that is natural as well; indeed, that at bottom most of our knowledge, if not all, is based on symbols which he supposed were conceivable, but which at last he discovers to be inconceivable. It is, however, in the highest degree amusing to find the founder of agnosticism turning at last upon his own famous principle, combating it, utterly repudiating it, and rejecting it as of no value, when it is urged against his theory of use-inheritance by the natural selectionists. Even with Mr. Spencer it makes a world of difference whose ox is gored. He seems to have forgotten that it is the philosophy of the unknowable, the corner-stone of agnosticism that he is crushing to atoms, or that "conceivability as the test of truth" ever loomed up in majestic proportions in his own philosophy. To show the worthlessness of his own once cherished principle he hurls fact after fact in the teeth of his opponents and asks them if they "can conceive any means" by which they can be explained and finally concludes by saying that:

> "The remarkable phenomena above described make it clear that inability to 'conceive any means' by which acquired characters impress themselves on the reproductive elements, *is no adequate reason* for assuming that they cannot do this."

But if "no adequate reason" in these cases, why should the "inability to conceive" be regarded as a valid argument against the supernatural processes? Why should it be deemed so efficacious against the unknowable? And why above all should the edifice of agnosticism be erected on such a foundation?

And thus does the great philosopher of evolution and agnosticism deliberately overturn every principle which he once maintained and combat every doctrine which he formerly advocated. All that he has received as the reward of his colossal labors is disappointment

and the knowledge that he has been chasing wandering fires. Like Sir Dagonet in "The Round Table," Mr. Spencer can truthfully say:

"I have had my day and my philosophies,"

but it is to be feared that his experience will only demonstrate conclusively to the world that all that is necessary to play the fool seriously is simply to ape the philosopher. Mr. Spencer has spent his life in endeavoring to undermine the knowledge that makes life valuable. He waged an unceasing warfare on everything that made life worth living. He even undertook to set up his own tabernacle on Mount Garizim in opposition to the real Jerusalem; and it is now a sad spectacle to see him with shivering limbs and cold trembling hands reaching out for a little of life's warmth. It is melancholy to listen to the feeble whinings of a wasted life that has brought him nothing but disappointment in spite of all the tremendous effort and energy. The Christian may well find comfort in his creed as he reads the dreary, hopeless musings of the philosopher of the unknowable and the founder of agnosticism.

S. FitzSimons.

Lima, N. Y.

PRE-HELLENIC WRITING IN THE ÆGEAN.

PHILOLOGY, coöperating with kindred sciences in the uneasy search after the origins of peoples and customs and languages, has discovered many a significant fact regarding the historic beginnings and intellectual progress of various races of men. Not the smallest addition to science in this direction has been the discovery and decipherment of various written languages belonging to nations whose civilized career antedates by many centuries the events recorded on the earliest pages of ordinary history. Where these studies have not brought us into new and correct cognizance of the origins of certain peoples or institutions, at least they have often suggested to us new principles of investigation. And to the scientist the determination of principles is sometimes more acceptable than the discovery of origins. Through the unriddling of her old hieroglyphic signs Egypt has broken her mystic silence and is narrating to the disciples of Champollion the strange details of her distant antiquity. Venerable Babylon and adjacent countries are now neither mute nor do they speak to us in unintelligible tongues ever since Grotefend in the first years of the nineteenth cen-

tury began to find out how to read the cuneiform records. Karians and Lykians and other Anatolic peoples who had been kept to our knowledge only through the unsatisfactory notices of the classic Greek writers, are now enjoying a fresh after-fame because inscriptions in their languages are beginning to be discovered. Even the Hittites, a people whose once powerful and important existence had been entirely forgotten, will finally give out some of their history to the world of scholars, although their inscriptions on the rocks of Asia Minor Chaldaea and Syria still baffle the skill of such scholars as Sayce and Ménant and Peiser.[1]

Even within the bounds of Greek lands, monuments inscribed in letters belonging to a long lost system of writing were discovered early in the nineteenth century.[2] These non-hellenic characters which have been intelligibly legible[3] since 1873, or somewhat earlier, were found on coins and other objects with inscriptions in the island of Kypros which lies on the highway between the Anatolian and the Western World, and has therefore always been partly European in its civilization and partly Asiatic. At first it might have been hoped that this discovery would considerably broaden our knowledge concerning the earlier ages of hellenic civilization. But all such hopes soon dwindled into small proportions when it became evident that this new-found alphabet of Kypros revealed to us no documents older than the fourth century before Christ. The only fact that need be added here concerning these enchorial Kypric characters is that evidently they were not originally intended for the Greek language, although such is the language of these Kypric inscriptions. Each character represents an entire syllable rather than a simple phonetic sound. Accordingly the set of characters constitute a "syllabary" and not an "alphabet," as this latter term is usually understood. Where and when this Kypric syllabary originated is still unknown.

In the second millennium before our era, a remarkable civilization flourished in the islands and mainland round about the Ægean Sea. Until some twenty or thirty years ago, all accurate knowledge of the quondam existence of this civilization had been lost. For it is only as a result of the archæological investigations that followed the successful excavations of the explorer Schliemann in Argolis of Greece and at Troy of Asia Minor that the rise and spread and downfall of a pre-Homeric civilization came to be accorded a place amongst admitted historic facts. In the selecting of a name for this pre-historic and

---

[1] See Peiser, "Die hetitischen Inschriften, ein Versuch ihrer Entzifferung." Berlin, 1892.

[2] Le Duc de Luynes, "Numismatique et inscriptions Cypriotes." Paris, 1852.

[3] Deecke, "Die griechisch-kyprischen Inschriften in Epichorischer Schrift;" in Collitz, "Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften," Band I.

pre-hellenic period of civilization, much stress was laid on the fact that the first evidences of its power and magnificence had been found in the Argolid city of Mykenæ. The "Mykenæic Age" therefore is the conventional name for that unique period of human development and culture which is computed to have been well in its ascendancy earlier than 1,700 years before Christ and to have tragically come to a premature end about 1,000 years before our era. In the age during which the familiar Homeric poems were composed, the culture which had been sustained by many generations of Mykenæic peoples had long since entirely disappeared, leaving but few traces that did not soon become obliterated. There grew up a newer phase of human activity, inaugurated by the incoming of new and, at first, ruder tribes of men. Nevertheless the splendors of Mykenæic days were still dimly recalled in the songs of the troubadours and in the myths of folk-story and cult, even though no clear historical consciousness of this former and faded glory had been transmitted to the men of the age at which the Homeric poems were made. The duty of rediscovering it and of restoring it to its proper pedestal of honor amongst the epochs of human progress has agreeably fallen to the lot of modern historians.

Since the archæological discoveries demonstrate that this splendid period of culture had spread its influence over a large and populous area and had endured for so many centuries, scholars were somewhat disappointed by the fact that no positive indications of any sort could be unearthed which would strengthen if not demonstrate the logical assumption that these otherwise highly intelligent men were not entirely without some technical system of recording events and of communicating with each other by written messages. Indeed the strange belief that throughout the entirety of their long career the Mykenæic peoples continued to be ignorant of letters, began to cease from being considered as untenable. Nevertheless on historical grounds such a belief was not logical, for most peoples who in any near way approach to the degree of civilization then prevalent in the Ægean possess and employ some method of recording thought. Moreover, other nations who, like the Egyptians and the Babylonians, were contemporaries of the Mykenæic peoples, and were in regular intercourse with them, already possessed well-developed systems of writing; and if the men of the Ægean had no native writing signs, at least they would have adopted some one of the methods in vogue amongst their neighbors.

But in the year 1880, the American traveler Stillman, while visiting the island of Krete, observed and noted certain peculiar signs incised on large blocks of gypsum that formed the facing of the walls of a prehistoric building on the deserted site of the ancient

town of Knossos.[4] Stillman's scholarly acumen led him to rightly[5] conjecture that the ruins which he saw here must be the remains of the famous "labyrinth" of Kretan legend, and that the signs which were marked on the blocks of gypsum must be characters pertaining to some kind of writing.

The next fore-warning which indicated that finally records dating from the Mykenæic Age would probably come to light, happened in the year 1889. Doctor Tsountas, the well-known archæologist and ephor of antiquities in Greece, during the progress of excavations which he then was conducting at Mykenæ on the top of the citadel there, found a small pestle of stone on which a group of a few simple characters was incised.[6] These characters may possibly be a mark indicating the owner or maker of this household utensil. It was soon observed that one of the signs in this short inscription seems to resemble one of the letters in the previously known Kypric syllabary.[7]

Similarly other letter-like signs were found sporadically at other places. And at last, in the year 1893, the reasonably suspected existence of Mykenæic writing was turned into indubitable fact. Mr. A. J. Evans, keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, in the course of a voyage of discovery in Eastern Krete, found in the possession of the inhabitants a large number of odd-shaped gems and other small stones inscribed with signs which certainly appeared, even at first examination, to be letters of a hitherto unknown variety. By their peculiar technique and material these gems and stones testify in their own behalf that they are very ancient, and indisputably date back to the remotest centuries of the Mykenæic Age. Some of them are bean-like in shape, and others are glandular. Some of them may have originally been intended to be used as amulets and worn on the body as protective against certain evil influences and misfortunes, while others were certainly intended to be used as seals or signets. While these incised seal-stones have been found most plentifully of all in Krete, they also are sometimes discovered elsewhere, chiefly on the islands, however, and on this account they have come to be frequently mentioned as "Island Gems."

When, by successive and abundant finds, the number of Mykenæic objects with inscriptions on them became large enough to justify an attempt at a comparative study of the various characters inscribed, it immediately became apparent that more than one dis-

---

[4] "Second Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Archæological Institute of America, 1880-1881," pp. 47-49.

[5] Arthur J. Evans, "Cretan Pictographs and Præ-Phœnician Script," in "Journal of Hellenic Studies," 1894, pp. 280-281.

[6] "Transactions of the Archæological Society at Athens, 1889." P. 19 (in Greek).

[7] "Tsountas and Manatt," "The Mycenæan Age." Boston, 1897, p. 268.

tinct system of writing were represented on these engraved objects. At least two clearly independent styles of character could be recognized.[8] One of these employed pictorial or hieroglyphic signs. Herein a comparison with Egyptian writing was immediately suggested. The other style was made up of letters which were cut in a less pictorial way and in more linear shapes, and therefore present a quasi-alphabetic appearance distantly resembling even modern letters.

The plausible theory that most systems of writing have started from crude and simple picture-writing receives additional confirmation from both these classes of pre-hellenic Ægean writing. As regards the pictographic signs, it has been noticed that three[9] well-marked stages may clearly be traced in their gradual development from primitive image-writing up through a transitional period in which the characters are in part still the original images and in part abbreviated and conventionalized hieroglyphs, finally becoming in the third stage a completely conventionalized hieroglyphic or pictographic symbol, then no longer representing simply what is indicated by the rudely outlined primitive picture, but expressing some additional or even entirely different thought or word which in the course of time came to be associated with that primitive picture. However, the dissimilarity which these three grades bear towards each other is one which is the natural result of growth and development, and indicates no radical difference. All three grades are therefore properly included under one general name. They are known as "Pictographs."

That the second kind of Mykenæic writing, which Mr. Evans properly calls "linear" script, is also an outgrowth from the original or ideographic forms of these pictographs which we have just been considering is quite improbable, although this linear script undoubtedly had some kind of image-writing for its original form. The most acceptable supposition which the present state of the question permits is that the two kinds of writing sprang up each independent of the other and from an independent set of original images. It may therefore be now accepted as an indisputably ascertained historical truth that within the boundaries of the pre-Hellenic Greek world there contemporaneously existed at least two different and separate kinds of writing. Thus have the inhabitants of the ancient Mykenæic kingdoms lately gained new glory in the eyes of the modern world because of the satisfied conviction that they were not entirely ignorant of letters.

---

[8] Evans, "Cretan Pictographs," p. 275.

[9] Evans, "Further Discoveries of Cretan and Ægean Script: with Libyan and Proto Egyptian Comparisons." In J. H. S., xvii., 1897, pp. 331-338.

Now, after archæological discovery and philological investigation have promulgated the former existence of these systems of writing in Greek lands during the Mykenæic Ages, the persuasion more and more irresistibly asserts itself that we would be unable to reasonably understand so perfect and high a civilization as the Mykenæic without postulating the contemporary prevalence of some kind of writing there. On *a priori* grounds writing must be enumerated amongst the Mykenæic arts, since it is now evident that this art was known amongst other and less highly advanced peoples of Europe. All branches of anthropological and ethnical studies converge to the belief that in the islands of the Ægean and on the shores of the adjacent mainlands we ought to locate one of the very early centres of culture in Europe. In other parts of European territory, as, for instance, in northern Italy, where pre-historic civilization was not in a state of such advanced perfection as it was in the Ægean, there are nevertheless visible indications that there existed the ability and habit of recording events or facts in some way.[10]

After becoming a convert to the belief in the existence of a Mykenæic or pre-Homeric writing, it is possible to more intelligently interpret the dim reference in the Iliad to some kind of writing which is mentioned as having been in vogue during the remote ages made memorable by the deeds of Homer's heroes, and to put some kind of credence in the myth which attributed to Palamedes the invention of a system of writing.[11] In a celebrated passage of the Iliad[12] it is narrated that Prœtos, who was king of Argos in Mykenæic or possibly pre-Mykenæic times,[13] sent a written and sealed message from his palace at Tiryns to his father-in-law in Lykia of Asia Minor, the import of this secret message being that Bellerophon, the bearer of it, should be put to death, for he had sinned against the honor of the house of Prœtos. Prœtos' dreadful letter, his "semata lygra," was probably expressed not by linear characters, but by hieroglyphic signs.[14] Thus are woven into one of the weirder episodes of the Iliad threads from an obscure recollection of the fact that the long vanished men of the great Mykenæic Age had some pictorial or graphic way of corresponding with each other. Likewise the story of Palamedes now would seem to have been

[10] Bordier, "Origines prehistoriques de l'ecriture." In the "Bulletins de la Societé dauphinoise d' Ethnographie et d' Anthropologie," Vol. IV., Grenoble, 1897; F. Mader, "Le iscrizioni dei Laghi delle Meraviglie e di Val Fontanalba nelle Alpi Marittime." In the "Rivista mens. d. Club alpino ital.," Vol. XX., p. 82; Issel, "Le rupi scolpiti nelle alte valli delle Alpi Marittime." In the "Bulletino di Paletnologia Italiana," anno xxvii., Ottobre-Dicembre, 1901.

[11] Philostratos, Heroikos, 10, 8; Scholion to Orestes of Evripides, 422.

[12] VI., 168-170.

[13] Ridgway, "The Early Age of Greece," I., 209-210.

[14] Leaf, in his edition of the Iliad, p. —.

built upon some foundation of truth. For he also belonged to this pre-historic age, and lived in the Mykenæic town of Navplion in the Argolid, where some vestiges of writing have been found in the course of the excavations carried on during these last years. The myth, however, which bestows on Palamedes the honor of being the inventor of writing is only dimly known to us. For the Greeks of historic times employed the so-called Phœnician alphabet which, according to a later myth, was introduced into Greece by the Phœnician Kadmos. And this Kadmean story may have overshadowed the Palamedean one.

It is on the island of Krete that the most valuable collections of documents with pre-hellenic writings on them have been discovered. This may be due merely to chance; but nevertheless Krete has been so eminently and generously the land of these finds as to make it easy of belief that the Kretans more than any other Mykenæic nation made frequent use of the practice of keeping records, and brought this civilizing art to considerable perfection. The degree of kinship existing between the Kretan methods of writing and the methods used by the other contemporaneous inhabitants of Mykenæic countries has not yet been ascertained. It may even be possible to suspect that the specimens discovered in other places belong not to the same system as do the Kretan documents, but to independent and perhaps less frequently employed and less advanced methods. It therefore would not be entirely absurd to be inclined to confidently expect forthcoming proofs of the assertion that the pictographs at least, if not also the characters of the Kretan linear script, were a native product peculiar to Krete, and that the other systems which were used elsewhere in Greece during this Bronze Age or Mykenæic period were independent of Krete, being either local creations or else importations. One reason why the quantity of written documents discovered in Krete exceeds so surprisingly the quantity found elsewhere is possibly because in Krete use was made of writing material of a less perishable nature than may have commonly been selected for this purpose in the other parts of the Mykenæic world. Amongst other races whose degree of civilization corresponds somewhat to that of the Mykenæic peoples it is not always the less perishable material of stone or bronze or other similarly durable substances that is used for writing upon, but rather leaves, and bark, and leather and other cheap and practical but easily destructible stuffs of this kind. Even in Krete the finds are not as rich and important as they would have been if solid and lasting materials had been exclusively in use here as material to write upon. We have some testimony preserved in literature to the effect that these old Kretans were practical enough to also use more easily manageable

material and to have had the habit of writing on certain kinds of leaves.

The seal-stones and gems which bear the pictographic letterings have been found mostly in Eastern Krete. A number of them were procured by purchase from the village women there. Most of them are cut from steatite, or soapstone, a mineral which exists in large quantities in Krete. They owe their long and good preservation not to the insignificant money value of the material from which they are made, but simply to the fact that they have been regarded as amulets, and for ages the successive generations of Kretan women have been wearing them as such attached to a string which they tie round the neck. Possibly their original purpose was, as already stated, in part amuletic.

Fortunately our knowledge of these pictographs is not confined to what we get from the steatite seal-stones and amulets. For at Knossos, which lies in the central part of Krete, and which was in Mykenæic days the palace of the powerful and terrible King Minos, whose after-fame made him a mythic hero, a great quantity of clay tablets, clay lables and other such objects have been dug up by Mr. Evans, bearing inscriptions some in pictographic characters and others in linear script. These clay inscribed tablets are not very different[15] in shape from those already so well known to scholars from the large finds of cuneiform inscriptions at Babylon. This striking identity of a peculiar writing material in Babylon and in Krete need be the occasion for no disquieting surprise. Communication between the islands of the Ægean and distant Babylon in the Bronze Age is otherwise well authenticated. In the Mediterranean region—on the island of Kypros, more exactly—there has been found a genuine imported Babylonian tablet with cuneiform writing upon it. It was certainly brought into this part of the world from Babylon at a very early date.[16] The greatest quantity of the clay tablets of Mykenæic Knossos bear linear script. In fact, outside of one single deposit of pictographic tablets all the others are of the linear script.[17]

Inasmuch as the most primitive of these pictographs belonged to a variety of pure image-writing, they were intended to convey no other thoughts than those portrayed by the picture, or else suggested by it, at least remotely. But how far they gradually departed from being ideographs, coming to stand not so much for a concrete object as for a word or definite articulate sound or for the name of an object, and ultimately, in their upward progress towards

[15] J. L. Myres, in "Man," 1901, No. 2, p. 6.

[16] Bezold, in the "Zeitschrift für Keilinschriften," II., 1885, pp. 191-193; Much, "Die Kupferzeit," 2d edition, p. 372.

[17] Evans, in the "Annual of the British School, at Athens, 1899-1900," p. 59.

perfection, to indicate a syllabic sound, as did the Egyptian hieroglyphs and the Kypric characters, cannot yet be determined. However, the peculiar groupings of the characters as noticed on some of the seal stones would lead to the conjecture that the Kretan pictographs, in their latest stage, had indeed come to have a syllabic value. But this is the very highest perfection that can be claimed for them. They certainly never became purely phonetic in value.

Although no one has yet been able to read a single word from these pictographic seals, and, therefore, there is no way of our knowing with any kind of appreciable preciseness the contents of the inscriptions, nevertheless now and then the pictographic quality of the signs conveys even to us something of the idea which was to be conveyed to the original Mykenæic observers or readers. Thus we can get a distant view of the meaning of such signs as a *ship*, or *jars filled with grain*, or *milk pots*, etc. But even in such exceptional cases the faint idea comes to us unclothed by any Mykenæic word, and therefore through these inscriptions we have yet learned nothing about the language of the Mykenæic Kretans.

It is not improbably asserted that since there flourished in Krete two distinct and apparently unrelated systems of writing, there may have been a reason for it in the fact that each kind of writing represented either a different language or a clearly different dialect. Now the fact that the pictographs have, with the exception of those on the tablets of a single deposit at Knossos, nearly all been found in Eastern Krete is coupled with the other fact that in very early historic times this eastern part of the island was inhabited by a peculiar race of men known from Homeric times down as Eteokretans[18] and the opinion has been harbored that the pictographic inscriptions especially represent the language of these Eteokretans. Credibility is added to this opinion by the recent discovery of two inscriptions[19] on the site of the ancient town of Præsos in the eastern part of the island, written indeed in a legible Greek alphabet of the fifth century B. C., but yet in a language which has not yet been identified as being Hellenic. Some have suspected that it is not even of the Indo-European family of languages. Archæologists of four different nations, English, French, Italians and Americans, have during the past year been feverishly exploring and excavating in Eastern Krete with the hope of discovering some more decisive clue to the language of the Eteokretans. And perhaps some fortunate discovery here may eventually furnish the magic key to their

---

18 Odyssey, xix., 176.

19 Comparetti, "Le Leggi di Gortyna e le altre Iscrizioni arcaiche Cretesi, 1893." Mon. Ant., Vol. III., p. 451 ff., and Bosanquet, "Archæology in Greece, 1900-1901," in J. H. S., xxi., 1901, p. 340.

language and to the reading of the pictographs. For that the Eteokretan language was preserved down to as late as the fifth century B. C. seems proven by these two inscriptions of Præsos.

There accordingly exists much doubt as to whether the pictographs of Krete are the carriers of a non-hellenic tongue or not. But as regards their indigenous origin no such wide room for doubt exists. They were certainly developed here in the Ægean, and quite possibly within the limits of the island of Krete. They do indeed show some affinities to other systems of hieroglyphic writings, especially to that of the Egyptians[20] and of the Hittites,[21] but yet are essentially different from the one and from the other. These similarities are due in part to the very nature of ideographic writing, in part to the influence of intercommunication, for the intercourse with Egypt and with the countries of Anatolia and northern Syria, where the Hittites dwelt, was regular and strong, and also in part to direct copying. For admittedly there are in the Kretan pictographs a few characters which seem to have been borrowed straight from the Egyptians. For instance, among the hieroglyphs deciphered on the finds at Knossos is the so-called "palace-sign" of Egypt.[22]

Since these pictographs are images of things that were familiar to the Mykenæic people of Krete, they very instructively illustrate for us the civilization of those days. From the discoveries made up to the present year more than one hundred different pictorial signs or separate pictographs have been recognized and classified according to their form. Amongst these are depicted, for example, weapons, implements, instruments, household utensils, fishes, animals, birds, plants, heavenly bodies, etc. It is unnecessary to separately take up each one of these and similar objects and to show in detail what rich additions to our knowledge of the Mykenæic civilization may be gained therefrom. The lyre was already known, for it is amongst the pictographs. It is represented as having eight strings.

The pictographs occur most frequently in small groups of from two to seven characters. From the direction in which the pictographs face, it seems that many of the inscriptions were to be read from right to left,[23] as Hebrew letters are read. But other inscriptions are written boustrophedon,[24] and have to be read, like some of the early inscriptions in Greek, from right to left and from left to right alternately. Often, on the seals, they are scarcely in a straight line at all, but present an unarranged and jumbled aspect, so that it

[20] Evans, "Cretan Pictographs," p. 316.
[21] Evans, in the "Annual of the Brit. School at Athens, 1899-1900," p. 61.
[22] Evans, in the "Annual, 1899-1900," p. 61.
[23] Evans, "Cretan Pictographs," 301.
[24] Evans, in "Annual," etc., 1899-1900, p. 61.

is difficult to know in what order they were intended to be read. In the more careful inscriptions on the clay tablets at Knossos the pictographed words or phrases are sometimes separated from each other by a mark of division shaped like the letter "x." Thus is the correct aspect of separate words or phrases ascertainable.

The most ancient specimens of seals with these pictographic signs are of very primitive art. On the evidence of the technique of these seals, and of the other objects found along with them, the opinion is to be accepted that the most antique specimens go back to the age contemporary with the Twelfth Dynasty of Egypt, that is, to the period included between the years 2500 and 2300 before Christ, approximately, or to the second half of the third millenium before our era.[25]

The second kind of Ægean writing, the linear script, is typologically much younger in appearance than the pictographs. But chronologically it may be just as ancient as its older-looking rival. The linear system seems to have been known and used over a much wider area than the pictographs. For while the pictographs may have prevailed nowhere outside of Krete, the linear writing, on the contrary, is found in several other islands and on the mainland of Greece, although it must not be too readily taken for granted that all of these scattered specimens of linear writing belong to one and the same system. At Knossos alone, which has been the most productive mine for finds of both varieties of writing, the quantity of tablets with linear characters far outnumbers those with pictographic signs.

The first known specimen of a clay tablet with linear script was seen by Mr. Evans at Kandia in Krete in the year 1896. This first specimen no longer is known to exist, for the house which contained it was sacked by Turkish soldiers during the war which followed shortly after. But in the spring of 1900, in the excavations which Mr. Evans was conducting at Knossos, entire hoards of these tablets began to appear. Ever since that time the existence of a linear script in Mykenæic times cannot be subject to the slightest doubt. Outside of Knossos the other most noteworthy places at which inscriptions or characters in this style of writing have been found are the Diktæan Cave in Krete, the island of Melos and the island of Kos. At the Cave of Diktæan Zevs a portion of a dedicational inscription incised in characters of this kind is preserved on a sacrificial altar.[26] On the island of Melos, at a place now called Phylakope, there exist remains of four successive settlements or towns on one and the same site. The undermost and oldest one dates from

[25] Evans, "Further Discoveries," etc., in J. H. S., xvii., 1897, p. 327.
[26] Evans, "Further Discoveries," etc., p. 350.

the neo-lithic epoch; the uppermost and latest existed down to the close of the Mykenæic period. And in this latest town a large number of potsherds have been dug up which are inscribed with linear signs that have been scratched upon the clay by the makers of the pottery before it was baked.[27] And these same signs seem to have been in use at Phylakope even as anciently as the Second Settlement on this site, that is, almost at the beginning of the Bronze Age.

In the island of Kos there still stands a splendid citadel which was built in the fifteenth century by the Knights of Rhodes. The Knights took as material for their fort the stones of an old wall which had been built to protect the city and harbor in the year 366[28] before Christ. On these blocks there are yet clearly visible the letters strongly carved on them as "mason's marks" by the men of the fourth century before Christ, when they were hewing the stones. And, strange to say, among the letters used, which are those of the universal Greek alphabet of that century, occur four signs which are not Greek letters, but which resemble four of the Kretan linear signs. Their presence can be explained in various ways. Herzog, who discovered them, thinks that they are the last and crystallized remains of the once commonly used linear script.[29] A few specimens of linear signs have likewise been found at Siphnos, at Mykenæ,[30] at Navplion, at Menidi in Attika, on the island of Kythera, and even at Gurob and Kahun in Egypt,[31] and at Lachish[32] in Palestine.

What was stated concerning the indigenous nature of the pictographs may with safety be repeated in regard to the linear script. It is not of foreign and imported origin, but was developed in the region of the Ægean. On account of being more perfect typologically than are the pictographs, the *a priori* supposition is plausible that they are therefore later, belonging to a subsequent and more advanced period of civilization. But nevertheless this supposition seems to be incorrect. On deeper observation the linear script appears to be of equal age with the pictographs. It is not derived from them, although it really goes back to image-writing for its origin. The two systems, pictographic and linear, seem, however, though they were never identical, to have mutually influenced each other somewhat in Krete. The Kretan linear system, regarded

---

27 Hogarth, in "Annual," 1897-1898, pp. 12 and 25.

28 "Diodoros," xv., 76.

29 Herzog, "Bericht uber eine epigraphisch-archäologische Expedition auf der Insel Kos. in the Jahrbüch d. Kais. arch. Inst. xvi., 1901," p. 133.

30 Tsountas and Manatt, "The Mycenæan Age," p. 26, figs. 137, 138, 139.

31 Petrie, "Illahun, Kahun and Gurob." Plate xv.

32 Bliss, "A Mound of Many Cities; or, Tell el Hesy Excavated," *passim.*

from a technical point of view, is much superior not only to the pictographs of the same country, but is ahead of the contemporary writing systems of Babylon and Egypt.[33] Although a native product, there is nevertheless something of direct Egyptian influence to be noticed in this linear writing, as was also observed to be true in regard to the pictographs. The "ankh" and "ka" frame are here represented. But still this linear script is not Egyptian, nor is it Anatolian. And no scholars, save those who try to derive the whole of Mykenæic culture from the East, making it to be Lydian or Karian or Hittite or even Phœnician would now persist in attempting to find a foreign origin for the linear script of the Ægean.

The inscribed tablets of Knossos are elongated cakes of clay, from 4.50 to 19.50 centimetres in length and from 1.20 to 7.20 wide.[34] They do not much differ from cakes of chocolate in shape and color. The inscriptions were incised with a sharp-pointed stylus, while the clay from which they were made was still damp. Then they were dried by the heat of the sun. Most of the tablets unearthed at Knossos had been stored away in chests located in different rooms of the vast labyrinthic palace. Considering their friable nature it is a matter of surprise that the debris and soil in which they lay buried ever since the sudden destruction of the palace have preserved them so well for four thousand years. This mythic palace of Minos came to its tragic end in a great conflagration, as the researches of excavation show. And it is to the heat of this fire that the good preservation of the tablets is in part due. They were thus baked into a more durable nature. The coffers in which these tablets were lying stored away when the conflagration fell upon the palace had been officially closed and were bound by cords which could not be removed except by breaking the official seal that was stamped upon them. Thus the tablets could not be tampered with. A few of the impresses of these seals have been found.

These clay tablets undoubtedly referred to the affairs of the powerful rulers who lived in the labyrinth. They are the palace archives. Many of them evidently relate to accounts concerning tribute, or to the royal stores. They contain numeral signs which have been recognized and in part deciphered and interpreted. Judging from such suggestive comparison as can be made with the tablets of Babylon, it may be suspected that others of these Knossian tablets refer to royal correspondence, or to treaties and compacts, or judicial decisions or proclamations, etc.[35] The original value of the information contained in the records is shown by the precautions employed

[33] Evans, "Annual," 1889-1900, p. 57.
[34] Evans, "Annual," 1899-1900, p. 56
[35] Evans, Knossos, in "Annual," 1899-1900, pp. 57-58.

to prevent all falsification. Many of the tablets show two countermarks or indorsements made by controlling officials. One of these countermarks is on the face of the tablet, where the writing is, and the other is on the back of the tablet.[36]

The inscriptions are never long. Most of the clay tablets have only one or two lines of script, which oftenest runs lengthwise along the upper face of the tablet. Only one notably long inscription has been found. It contains twenty-four lines of writing. Such tablets as have more lengthy inscriptions are scored with horizontal marks which separate the lines of writing from each other and served as guidance for the scribe when he was incising the letters. The writing runs from left to right invariably. Sometimes the words are separated from each other by short upright lines. The letters are usually incised with skillful care, and, when the tablet happens to be well preserved, the characters are quite easily legible.

There is no reason for believing that the writing on these linear tablets is ideographic rather than phonetic or syllabic. The separate characters employed are about seventy in number. These would not be at all sufficient for a complete and satisfactory set of ideographs. But, on the other hand, seventy characters would seem too many for a phonetic or alphabetic method. The opinion which therefore remains to be preferred is that they are neither ideographic nor strictly phonetic, but that they belong to a syllabic system.

No effectual clue has as yet been discovered to the reading of this linear script. Whether the language represented is Hellenic or not is yet to be determined. If, as some think, the Kypric syllabary was derived from this linear script, then the language of the Knossian tablets is quite possibly not Hellenic. For the Kypric syllabary presents peculiarities which convince us that it was first intended for a tongue not only unhellenic but even non-Aryan. However, the resemblance of the Knossian characters to the Kypric syllabary is not sufficient to establish unmistakable identity. Mr. Evans tried to read a few of the Kretan inscriptions by giving Kypric values to the linear characters, but his attempt led to no tangible results.[37] Dr. Kluge[38] also made a determined attempt to read the Kretan characters, but likewise labored in vain. We can therefore as yet affirm nothing about the language hidden behind these inscriptions.

Like the pictographs, these linear signs are very old. The oldest linear inscriptions go back to about 2,000 years before Christ,[39] and

---

[36] Evans, "Annual," 1899-1900, p. 56.
[37] "Cretan Pictographs," p. 352.
[38] "Die Schrift der Mykenaeer Cöthen," 1897.
[39] Evans, "Further Discoveries," p. 361.

therefore are about five hundred years earlier than the Moabite Stone and the Baal Lebanon bowls which present us with the most ancient inscriptions in Phœnician letters. Since the classical alphabet of Greece was an adaptation from the letters of the Phœnicians, and was applied to the Greek language not earlier than the ninth century, we see that its presence on Greek soil was preceded by the extensive prevalence of an older system of writing more than a thousand years before these so-called Phœnician letters were brought in. But for reasons which need not be repeated here, it must be presumed that the Phœnician alphabet was originally developed from some system of pictorial writing, and the names of some of the Phœnician letters, together with their most primitive shapes, make it easy for the supposition to arise that the Phœnician alphabet was really derived, either wholly or in part, from the very image-writing as is found in Krete.[40] If this be true, then the Phœnician alphabet and the Greek letters which in their derivatives have become the alphabet of most of the civilized nations of the world go back to the prototypes of the Ægean script as they were used more than four thousand years ago. And the alphabet in which this *Quarterly* is printed could then trace its long line of descent back to beyond the tablets and seal-stones of pre-historic civilization in the Eastern Mediterranean.

In 1901 new discoveries at Knossos brought to light a fresh series of letter-like signs, inscribed on rings of bone, resembling bracelets, and on other small objects.[41] These latest-found Mykenæic signs are linear in type, but are not like those other linear ones which we have been describing. Twenty characters of this third kind of writing have been recognized, fourteen of which are practically identical with later Greek alphabetic forms. This is another great surprise.

It is necessary to add that the discovery of this Ægean writing may turn out to be one of the most important historical revelations of modern times. For it may possibly furnish us with written documents regarding the history of man in this most interesting quarter of the Old World, the Eastern Mediterranean, from the closing of the neo-lithic Age down to the end of the Bronze Period, when better known historical times begin. These inscriptions will not continue to defy all attempts to decipher them. Some di-grammic or bi-lingual record will furnish the first and necessary clue to the reading. After that all will be comparatively easy. In the meantime the world of philologians and historians are anxiously awaiting the raising of the mystic cloud that is yet covering this much de-

[40] J. L. Myres, in "Man," 1901. No. 2, p. 6.

[41] Evans, "The Palace of Knossos." Provisional Report of the Excavations for the year 1901. Reprinted from "Annual," 1900-1901.

sired knowledge. Mr. Evans is going to publish all the inscriptions hitherto found, so that such scholars as are interested may see and study the tablets. The Oxford University Press, which will print these publications of Mr. Evans, has begun to prepare itself for doing so by causing a fount of Mykenæic type to be cast. Nothing is now wanting save the discovery of something similar to the Rosetta-stone, and some new Champollion to do the first deciphering.

DANIEL QUINN.

Athens, Greece.

THE CONQUEST OF THE CAUCASUS BY RUSSIA.

[1] "La Russie dans l'Asie Mineure; ou Campagnes du Maréchal Paskevitch en 1828-9, et Tableau du Caucase sous le point de vue géographique, historique et politique." Par Feliks Petrovich Fonton. Paris, 1840.

[2] "Die Geschichte Russlands. Aus dem Russischen übersetzt von E. W." By Nicolai Gerasimov Ustryaloo. Stuttgart, 1840-43.

[3] "Der Kaukasus und das Land der Kosaken; in den Jahren, 1843-46." By Moritz Wagner. Dresden, 1848.

[4] "Schamyl als Feldherr, Sultan und Prophet, und der Kaukasus. By Dr. Friedrich Wagner. Leipzig, 1854.

[5] "Progress and Present Position of Russia in the East." By Sir John MacNeill. London, 1854.

[6] Die Völker des Kaukasus und ihre Freiheitskämpfe." By Friedrich Martin von Bodenstedt. Berlin, 1855.

[7] "Histoire de la Georgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu au XIX.c siècle." Publiée par M. F. Brosset. Saint Petersburg, 1848-59.

[8] "Sechzig Jahre des Kaukasischen Krieges; deutsch bearbeitel von G. Baumgarten." By General R. Fadyeev. Leipzig, 1861.

[9] Papers Respecting the Settlement of Circassian Emigrants in Turkey." June 6, 1864.

[10] "Rapport présenté au Conseil de Santé (de Constantinople) dans la Seánce du 28 Juin, 1864." Par le Docteur Barozzi. *Gazette Medicale d'Orient.* Constantinople, Juillet, 1864.

[11] "Aus Kaukasischen Ländern." Reisebriefe von Hermann Abich. Wien, 1896.

THE steady persistency with which, in spite of all obstacles, the aggrandizement of the Russian Empire is slowly but unceasingly carried on by its rulers has nowhere been so well exemplified as in the conquest of the Caucasus. The history of this long and tedious war, which lasted for sixty-four years, possesses at the present moment a special interest for other great communities, for it shows what a stubborn and prolonged resistance can be offered to a powerful State by a small and apparently insignificant nationality when the bravery of its warriors is aided by the wild and mountainous nature of its home. The Czars of Russia could dis-

pose at their will of all the military and financial resources of their immense Empire, unfettered by the criticisms of a free press or the obstruction of a Parliamentary opposition, and yet little more than a million of mountaineers, untrained and badly armed, it is true, but whose heroism was stimulated by religious enthusiasm; who were led by a man of surpassing military talents, and whose territory formed a natural fortress, defied all the efforts of their best generals and inflicted defeat after defeat on their troops for more than half a century before being finally subdued.

The sacrifices of men and money which were necessary before the authority of the Czar was firmly established over the Caucasian provinces may, perhaps, seem out of proportion to the value of the disputed territory, the greater part of which is a wilderness of sterile mountains; but they were amply repaid by the political and strategical advantages which were the result of the conquest. By the subjugation of this lawless district an end was put to the incursions and depredations of the robber tribes which inhabited its fastnesses, the communications between the shores of the Black Sea and those of the Caspian were rendered more easy and secure, and Russia not only strengthened her southern frontier, but made of it an impregnable stronghold whence she could descend at will on Persia or on Asia Minor.

This great chain of mountains, much of the interior of which was unknown to the Russians before the campaign of 1859, is about 700 miles long from Anapa on the Black Sea to Baku on the Caspian: its average width is between 70 and 80 miles and not more than 120 where it is widest. Only one high road, that leading from the fortress of Vladikaukaz, built by Prince Potemkin in 1784, through the pass of Dariel to Tiflis, crosses this vast mountain labyrinth which it divides into two nearly equal sections. The numerous tribes which inhabited the Caucasus to the west of this road previously to the Russian conquest, when they were for the most part compelled to emigrate, were known by the general denomination of Circassians or Tcherkesses, while those to the east, who were allowed to remain in their native mountains, were designated as Tchetchens and Lesghians, though under these names were comprised many different races speaking dissimilar dialects.

The series of campaigns which, after many vicissitudes of victory and defeat, overcame at last the resistance of these warlike tribes lasted from 1801 until 1864; but, during many centuries, the sovereigns of Russia had sought from time to time to extend their frontiers towards the south, and as far back as 966 A. D. Siratoslav the Grand Duke of Kiew (945-973) founded on the shores of the Sea of Azov, the principality of Tamau, which was destroyed by the Mon-

gol invasion of 1223. The advance towards the Caucasus was renewed in the sixteenth century, when the Grand Duke of Moscow, Ivan the Terrible (1533-1584) married the daughter of the chief of Kabarda, a territory situated to the north of the Central Caucasus, and took the title of Lord Kabarda. The Grand Duke then made war on the Tartars, from whom he took Kasan in 1551, and Astrakan in 1553 and extended his conquests along the northern shores of the Caspian Sea as far as the mouth of the Terck; but the long warfare with Poland and the Teutonic knights which began under his reign, and the civil wars which followed, hindered both him and his successors from making any further addition to their territories in the direction of the Caucasus.

It was not, indeed, for want of opportunities of pretexts. The Transcaucasian Princes who reigned over the small States which had been detached from the Kingdom of Georgia towards the end of the fifteenth century, were the vassals alternately of Turkey and Persia, according as the fortunes of war favored one or the other of the rival Mohammedan Empires which claimed the possession of the rich provinces between the Black Sea and the Caspian, but always with the certainty of seeing their lands ravaged and their Christian subjects persecuted by the conqueror. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at if, in their distress, they turned for help towards the nearest Christian power and claimed its intervention. The first to take this step was Alexander, King of Kaketia, who, in 1587, put himself under the protection of the Grand Duke Feodor Ivanowitch, and his example was followed at different times in the course of the seventeenth century by the princes of Mingrelia, Imeritia, Kartli and Georgia, but without meeting with any answer to their overtures. With the accession of Peter I. (1689-1725) the civil wars which had for so long diverted the attention of the Grand Dukes of Muscovy from the outer world, came to an end, and the resistless expansion of the Russian Empire in all directions, but more especially towards the South and the East, began. The massacre of three hundred Russian merchants in 1712 at Shamaka, near Baku in Persian territory, during an invasion of the Lesghians, and the impossibility of obtaining redress from the Shah Hussein, then at war with the Afghans, gave the Czar the opportunity of rendering himself master of the Caspian and of the roads leading through Persia into India. The campaign did not take place until 1722, when he set out from Astrakan with 50,000 men and a fleet of 422 vessels. After taking Derbent and Baku the Czar returned to Moscow, while his troops seized the rich province of Ghilan to the south of the Caspian; but the further progress of the Russian arms was checked by the victories of Nadir Kali, a soldier of fortune

from Khorassan, who drove the Afghans out of Persia and forced the Turks to renounce their claims to Georgia and the adjacent provinces. In presence of such a formidable enemy, the Empress Anne (1730-1740) deemed it more prudent to abandon the conquests of Peter the Great rather than incur the expenditure of men and money which would be necessary to preserve them; the Russian troops were, therefore, withdrawn to the left bank of the Terek, and the provinces they had invaded were restored to Persia.

No further attempt to advance towards the Caucasus took place until the reign of Catherine II. (1762-1796), when, at the close of a successful campaign against Turkey, terminated by the Treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardgi (1774), the Kuban and the Terek were recognized as the frontiers of the Russian Empire; and, by the same Treaty, Turkey yielded to Russia Great and Little Kabarda, of which the Czars were already nominally the sovereigns. The first step towards the acquisition of a strong position to the south of the Caucasus was marked by the treaty concluded in 1783 with Heraclius II., King of Georgia, who, in return for a pension of 60,000 roubles (about £20,000), consented to acknowledge the suzerainty of Russia, and agreed that his heirs should receive their investiture from the Czars. Persia could not offer any opposition to this transaction, as a civil war was then raging between the sons of Kerim Khan; but, when Aga Mohammed Kadjar, a soldier of fortune like Nadir Shah, had defeated all his competitors and seized the sovereign power, he invaded Georgia in 1798 at the head of a numerous army, and before the Russian troops could cross the Caucasus, he defeated Heraclius near Tiflis, burned that city, laid the country waste and carried off a large number of captives. The vanquished King fled to the mountains, where he shortly after died of grief, and the Russian Government is accused of having induced his son George XII., by a series of intrigues and acts of violence, to abdicate and transfer his rights and those of his heirs to the Czar.[1] It would, however, seem probable that the dissensions in the royal family caused by the change in the order of succession introduced by Heraclius, who had decided that the throne should pass to his younger son Alexander, and the civil war which was the result of this change determined the King to cede his territory to Russia.

Prince Alexander and two other younger sons of Heraclius had taken up arms to support their pretensions; they asked the Lesghians and Avars for help, and joined their bands when they descended from their mountains to ravage the lowlands. Russian troops had already been sent for by the King, and in May, 1800, two regiments crossed the pass of Dariel. They united their forces

[1] Bodenstedt (F. M. von), "Die Völker des Kaukasus," I., p. 140.

with those of the King, and, on November 6, they defeated the invaders, who lost their leader, Omar, Khan of the Avars, and 1,500 men. The King may have seen that the only safeguard for his country exposed to the constantly recurring aggressions of Turkey, Persia and the Caucasian tribes was a closer union with his powerful neighbor, and on December 28, when on his death-bed, he is said to have advised his nobles to offer the crown to the Emperor Paul. The Czar accepted the offer by an ukase dated January 18, 1801, and the act was ratified on September 12 by his successor, Alexander I., who, in a proclamation addressed to the people of Georgia, declared that it was not from interested motives, or with the object of extending the frontiers of the Empire, that he accepted the burden imposed upon him, but that he could not resist the cry of anguish which arose from the Georgian nation, and that he was resolved to establish in their country a strong government which should render justice to all and protect life and property.

The transfer to Russia of the Kingdom of Georgia, by whatever means it may have been brought about, was not accepted unanimously by the nation, and Queen Mariam, the widow of George XII., appears to have manifested too openly the anger felt by her subjects at the loss of their independence. Orders were therefore given in 1803 to send all the members of the royal family to Russia, and General Lazareff was charged with the execution of the imperial decree. Accompanied by an interpreter, the General forced his way into the Queen's apartments. As she refused to obey his summons, he sought to drag her away forcibly, when the Princess drew a dagger and stabbed him to the heart; and it was only the prompt arrival of her attendants which saved her from perishing beneath the blows of the interpreter, by whom she was severely wounded. She was then brought to a convent at Bielsgorod, in the Government of Kursk, where she was detained until 1811, when she went to reside in a villa near Moscow, and died there in 1850.[2]

Whether the Czar had been prompted by disinterested motives or by ambition when he accepted the crown of Georgia, the new acquisition was soon found to be, indeed, a heavy burden. The Mongol invasion of the thirteenth century, by depriving the Kings of Georgia of their power over the mountaineers of the Caucasus, had destroyed all order and civilization in that region, and the partitions of the kingdom among the sons of Alexander I. in the fifteenth century had still further enfeebled the State and had left it unable to defend itself against the incursions of the robber tribes which carried off prisoners, even under the walls of Tiflis, to supply the slave markets of Trebizond and Constantinople. The Khans of the

[2] Bodenstedt, I., p. 142.

adjoining districts of Gandja, Karabagh, Derbent and Baku took part in this traffic, and the armies of Turkey and Persia laid the land waste while upholding the claims of their respective sovereigns over all the States of Transcaucasia. Such were the enemies which it was necessary that the Russian Government should subdue before the newly acquired territory could be considered secure and serve as a basis of operations for a further advance.

The first Governor General of Transcaucasia was Prince Zizianoff, a Georgian by birth, but devoted to Russia, where he held the rank of General. His knowledge of the languages, manners and customs of the various races under his jurisdiction enabled him to win their confidence and acquire considerable influence over them, and he has left the reputation of having been the most talented and capable administrator who ever ruled the country. The Prince began the work of unification by seizing Mingrelia. He then demanded the tribute which the chiefs of Gandja had paid to the Kings of Georgia, and as it was refused, he invaded the Khanate, stormed the capital and annexed the territory to Russia, when the chiefs of the neighboring States of Baku, Derbent, Karabagh and Avaria immediately submitted and swore allegiance to the Czar. Shortly after, Feth Ali, Shah of Persia, invaded the provinces just subdued, but was defeated and driven back. Prince Zizianoff failed, however, to take Erivan, and on his raising the siege the Khanates revolted. That of Karabagh was soon reoccupied, but in the summer of 1805 Prince Zizianoff was treacherously assassinated at the gates of Baku, where he had been invited to meet the Persian Governor and receive his submission.

His successor, Count Gudowitch, though he had rarely more than 20,000 men under his command, won several important victories in a series of campaigns against Persia and Turkey, as the Mohammedan Empires had combined their forces in the hope of expelling the Russians from Transcaucasia. In the course of this war the Kingdom of Imeritia was annexed in 1810; the ports of Anapa and Poti, on the Black Sea, were taken from Turkey, and that of Lenkoran, on the Caspian, from Persia. The war with Turkey was ended by the treaty signed at Bucharest in 1812, by which Poti was restored to the Sultan; and the war with Persia by the treaty of Gulistan in 1813, in which Persia renounced all claim to the territories conquered by Russia, as well as the right of maintaining ships of war on the Caspian.

General Yermoloff was named Governor General of the Caucasian provinces in 1816, and all his efforts and those of his successors were directed towards the subjugation of the tribes which inhabited the great chain of mountains, and by their incessant forays spread

terror and devastation throughout the lowlands. The district which was most exposed to these incursions was that lying to the north of the mountains and known as Ciscaucasia. It is separated from the rest of Russia by the Kuban and the Terek, which descend from the central portion of the Caucasus and fall, the former into the Black Sea and the latter into the Caspian. Along these rivers had been established *stanitzas*, or fortified villages inhabited by Cossacks, who cultivated the surrounding fields without venturing very far beyond the range of the guns mounted on their ramparts. Peter the Great was the first to found these colonies, and his work was continued by Catherine II., who in 1770 and 1792 brought more of these irregular troops from their settlements on the Don, the Volga and the Dnieper. A line of small forts maintained the communications between these villages, and their garrisons sent out at night patrols which guarded every defile and every ford by which an enemy might be expected to pass.

Various tribes inhabited the district lying between this strongly guarded frontier and the Caucasus. The most westerly portion was occupied by the Adighes and the Nogai Tartars. The Kabardans, through whose territory runs the road leading over the mountains to Tieflis, held the centre, and to the east dwelt the Tchetchens, of whom only those in the lowlands could be regarded as subject to Russia, while the Tchetchens of the mountains, whose villages were scattered among the densely wooded ravines leading up to the fastnesses of the Lesghians in Daghestan, were still independent. All the Caucasian tribes lived by plunder, and the utmost vigilance on the part of the Russians could not save the lowlands from being periodically devastated by sudden incursions, nor even guard the Cossack villages from being surprised and burned. Expeditions were sent every year against some robber tribe, its villages, where every house was a citadel, were taken by storm with great loss of life and destroyed, but on the retreat of the Russian troops the strongholds were rebuilt and the tribe continued to lead the same lawless existence.

General Yermoloff, whose army was increased to the amount of 45,000 men, displayed an energy in the administration of his province and a severity in the repression of disorder which gained for him from the mountaineers the surname of "*Moskoff Scheitan*," "the Russian devil." He built new fortresses in Kabarda and Tchetchenia; he suppressed mercilessly a revolt in the province of Imeritia and inflicted on the Lesghians and Avars a crushing defeat at Khozrek in 1820, which broke up their confederacy.[3] He was, however, recalled in 1826 and was succeeded by Count Paskevitch,

[3] Felix Fonton, "La Russie dans l'Asie Mineure," p. 113.

shortly before the attempt made by Abbas Mirza, the Crown Prince of Persia, to reconquer the provinces recently annexed by Russia. The campaign was short; it proved disastrous to Persia and was ended by the treaty of Turkmanchai (February 10, 1827), by which Russia acquired the provinces of Erivan and Nakhitchevan; and the war with Turkey which followed was equally advantageous to Russia, which gained by the treaty of Adrianople (1829) the eastern shore of the Black Sea and a further augmentation of territory in Asia Minor.

The successful results of these two campaigns put an end to the intrigues by which the agents of Persia and Turkey had encouraged the independent tribes of the Caucasus to persevere in their resistance, and after a few more years of irregular warfare they would probably have been completely subdued, had not the sudden appearance of a new Mohammedan sect given a fresh stimulus to their patriotism and inflamed it to the highest pitch. This religious reform which cost the Russian Empire millions of roubles and the lives of thousands of its soldiers before it was suppressed, was set on foot by Mollah Mohammed of Jarach, a village in the district of Kurin. He was one of the most learned Ulema or Doctors of the Law in Daghestan, and he is said to have derived the ideas on which he founded his teaching from another of the Ulema, named Hadji Ismail, residing at Kundomir, in the province of Schirwan. The latter, who seems to have belonged to the school of pantheistic philosophy known as Sufism, professed to have had visions in which there had been revealed to him that the two sects of Sunnites and Shütes, into which the followers of Islam were divided, ought to be reunited for the purpose of carrying on a ceaseless warfare against the unbelievers. Under the influence of Hadji Ismail, Mollah Mohammed originated the religious reform known as Muridism, and spread it among the mountaineers. Its effect was to bind closely together the various tribes whom their differences of religious belief and their inherited feuds had until then kept separate and in a state of intertribal war, and to inspire them with an enthusiasm which enabled them to defy during many years the well armed and disciplined troops of the Russian Empire.

This new development of Islam taught that there are four degrees in the spiritual progress of man. In the first, known as *Shariat* (the Law), to which the mass of the people was bound to conform, the true believer was held to an exact observance of the precepts of the Coran and to the performance of the ceremonies it enjoins, which had been much neglected by the Mohammedans of the Caucasus. *Tharikat* (the Path), the second degree, was intended for those who aimed at rising to a higher degree of perfection and to the purely

spiritual worship of the Divinity. They took the name of *Murids* (disciples) and formed a military order bound by oath to die for the faith. They performed the rites prescribed by the Coran, not because such was the law, but from higher motives, because virtuous actions alone could lead them to the truth. The third degree was named *Hakikat* (the Truth), in which the soul was purified by contemplation until it became similar to the soul of the Prophet, and was favored by ecstatic visions in which it beheld the truth. Those who were promoted to this degree were named *Naïbs* or lieutenants. The fourth degree, named *Marifat* (Knowledge), was reserved for the Imam or supreme head of the sect, who was looked upon as being in direct communication with God, between whom and the true believers he acted as intermediary.

The teaching of Mollah Mohammed, the real object of which was the expulsion of the Russians, soon gave rise to so much excitement among the mountaineers, who came from all sides in pilgrimage to Jarach calling out for war against the infidel, that in 1824 General Yermoloff sent Aslan Khan, the chief of the district of Kasi-Kumick, who held the rank of colonel in the Russian army, to suppress the movement. The envoy, who was also a Mohammedan, was soon won over to the cause of Muridism by the eloquence of the Mollah, who rebuked him severely for his vassalage to Russia, but, not wishing to break openly with the Czar, he merely advised the Murids to be more guarded in their demonstrations of hostility, and returned to General Yermoloff with the false assurance that tranquillity had been restored and that no danger was to be apprehended.

General Yermoloff was recalled in 1826, and during the two following years his successor, Count Paskevitch, was hindered by the campaigns against Turkey and Persia from noticing the progress of the new doctrines, which were being spread throughout Daghestan and Tchetchenia by Kasi-Mollah, a disciple of Mollah Mohammed, who had conferred on him the title of Imam. Kasi-Mollah had not the genius of a statesman, but he knew how to excite the enthusiasm of the masses, and under his influence Muridism soon imposed its tenets on the majority of the inhabitants of the Eastern Caucasus. It enforced the democratic doctrines of Islam, according to which all true believers are perfectly equal; it put an end to the power of the nobles in those tribes which had been governed by hereditary chieftains, and it replaced the *Adat*, or the customary laws peculiar to each community, by the *Schariat*, or the laws of the Coran as interpreted by the *Mollahs*, who insisted on the exact observance of all the rules and ceremonies which it prescribes.

When the Russian Government became at last aware of the real tendency of this apparently purely religious movement, it had already

acquired too much power to be easily suppressed. In May, 1831, Kasi-Mollah defeated a Russian detachment and, encouraged by his success, called the mountain tribes to arms and proclaimed a holy war against the unbelievers. He took the town of Tarku, on the shore of the Caspian Sea, after defeating another column of Russian troops, and then beseiged the fortress of Burnaia, which stands on a steep hill above the town. The timely arrival of fresh troops saved the fort and Kasi-Mollah was obliged to retreat, but, taking advantage of the fact that many regiments had been withdrawn from the Russian garrisons in Central Daghestan for the purpose of defending the southern frontier, where a Persian invasion was expected, he attacked Derbend, which was held by only a few battalions. There again he was forced to raise the siege; then, after giving his followers some time to rest, he made, at the end of October, a rapid march of eighty miles past the Russian forts which guarded the lowlands, surprised and plundered the city of Kisliar on the Terek, inhabited by wealthy Armenian merchants, and brought his horsemen laden with booty safely back to their mountains.

In the spring of 1832 Kasi-Mollah was again in arms, making sudden descents where he was least expected, attacking the Cossack villages along the frontier and carrying off prisoners and cattle. It was not until October that Baron Rosen, who had succeeded Count Paskevitch as Governor General, was able to lead an expedition against Himri in the mountains of Daghestan, where the Imam resided. Kasi-Mollah had with him but a small body of Murids, but trusting to the strong position of the village, which was on a height surrounded with precipices, and accessible only by a narrow path cut through the rock, he resolved to resist. The Russian artillery soon leveled with the ground the walls and the towers which guarded the approaches to Himri, and the Murids who defended them died at their posts chanting verses from the Coran. The village was then stormed at the point of the bayonet, and Kasi-Mollah fell fighting to the last, but Schamyl, one of his most trusted lieutenants, and another Murid, succeeded in cutting their way through the Russians and escaped.

The mountain tribes remained in peace for a year after the death of Kasi-Mollah, and the Russians flattered themselves that Muridism had ceased to exist, but Mollah Mohammed raised Hamsad Beg, another of his disciples, to the rank of Imam, and in the beginning of 1834 the new leader had already assembled an army of 12,000 men in the district of Avaria. His object was to render himself master of Avaria before again attacking the Russians, as its chiefs had long been faithful to the Czars, and having treacherously assassinated the Khan of Kunzach, he seized his capital and put to death the remaining members of his family. The victims were soon avenged, for shortly afterwards the foster brothers of one of the murdered Princes stabbed Hamsad Beg when at prayers in the

Mosque of Kunzach, and the inhabitants of the town massacred the guard of Murids which surrounded him.

His successor was Schamyl, also a disciple of Mollah Mohammed, and he was chosen as Imam by the unanimous vote of the elders of the tribes which had adopted Muridism, although he warned them that, if elected, he would enforce rigorously the observation of the laws of the Coran, even at the risk of incurring the hostility of his fellow countrymen. Schamyl, who was born in Himri in 1797, had been the chief counsellor of his two predecessors, and had proved himself an intrepid soldier and a capable commander; he now showed himself to be a prudent and far-seeing statesman, whose aim was to bind the various Caucasian races into a single nationality, to suppress their intertribal wars and private feuds and inspire them with the sole idea of the expulsion of the Russians from their mountains.

The next few years were spent in desultory warfare without any definite plan. The Russians made frequent expeditions against the strongholds of the mountain tribes with varying success, but generally with great loss of life and without attaining any permanent advantage. They were driven out of Himri, but they destroyed Achulgho, a village situated on the summit of a steep and isolated rock, and they placed a garrison in Kunzach, while Schamyl, whose rule was now firmly established, partly by persuasion and partly by force, over Northern Daghestan and the mountainous portion of Tchetchenia, rebuilt Achulgho, fortified it and made it his headquarters. In presence of the rapid and unexpected development of Muridism, the Russian Government saw the necessity of sending out an expedition on a larger scale than usual in order to stamp out definitively a fanatical belief which, if allowed to spread from its native mountains into the neighboring Asiatic States, might excite the whole Mohammedan world to take arms against the nations of Christendom; and in June, 1839, General Golowin, Commander-in-Chief of the army of the Caucasus, sent General Grabbe with 8,000 men and seventeen guns to attack Achulgho for the second time.

On their way through the mountains the Russians, after a combat which lasted two days and cost Schamyl 2,000 killed and wounded, took the village of Arghuan, situated on the summit of a steep ascent, and defended by towers and loop-holed houses; but the position of Achulgho had been rendered so formidable that General Grabbe could only hope to take it by a regular siege. The two precipitous and closely adjoining masses of rock on which then stood Old and New Achulgho, whose population amounted to 4,000 souls, form a peninsula defended on three sides by deep ravines, through which flows the river Koisu, and the narrow chasm which separates the two rocks was crossed by a foot-bridge suspended at

the height of 140 feet above a mountain torrent which falls into the Koisu. Two long ridges of rock with precipitous sides and intersected by ditches and breastworks formed the only approach to the villages. On the side of Achulgo farthest from the Russian position the gorge through which the Koisu flows is so narrow in some parts that it can be easily bridged, and Schamyl was thus able to receive convoys of provisions and to augment his garrison to the number of 1,800 men, while the district lying in front is deeply furrowed and broken up by watercourses which impeded the communications between the Russian camps. It was also swept by the fire of the besieged Murids in Achulgho and by that of the ford of Surchai, built on the summit of an isolated peak. The siege began on June 25. Batteries connected by covered ways were erected at various points, but, though they succeeded in destroying the fort of Surchai after two attempts to storm it had failed, their guns were too light to produce much effect on the partly subterranean houses of Achulgho, and the inhabitants were able to repair at night the damage done by day. The first assault on Achulgho took place on July 28. It failed, for the Russian columns were checked by unforeseen obstacles, and they were obliged to retreat with the loss of over 1,300 men. A second assault took place on August 24, and was not more successful than the first, but Schamyl, whose position was becoming desperate, since the Russians, by occupying the left bank of the Koisu, had prevented him from receiving further supplies, asked for a truce, and sought to obtain favorable terms. The negotiations lasted three days, but as Schamyl's demands were too exorbitant to be granted the attack was renewed on September 2. After desperate fighting, which lasted all day and cost the Russians over 600 killed and wounded, the Murids, by Schamyl's orders, withdrew at nightfall into Old Achulgho. This, too, was taken next day, as the Russians seized the bridge connecting the villages before it could be destroyed. The Murids, at bay in their last stronghold, fought with all the energy of despair. Many of the women even took part in the defense or flung their children and themselves over the precipices that they might not fall into the hands of the Russians, and the fighting in the streets from house to house lasted a week. Schamyl, however, was nowhere to be found, to the great disappointment of the Russians, whose victory lost thereby much of its importance. When the fall of Achulgho was close at hand the Imam had taken refuge with his family and a few Murids in one of the many caves overhanging the Koisu, whence at night he let down a raft into the river. The Russian sentinels fired on it as it was rapidly borne away, and Schamyl, profiting by their attention being thus diverted, fled with his companions in the direction of Himri.

An encounter with one of the Russian advanced posts failed to stop the fugitives, though Schamyl and one of his children were wounded, and the next morning, crossing the Koisu, they found a safe retreat in the forests of Itchkeri.

The dearly bought conquest of Achulgho, which the mountaineers had regarded as impregnable, though glorious for the Russian army, which lost 5,000 men during the siege,[4] was productive of no useful results. When the two villages had been destroyed the district was evacuated, the troops returned to their usual stations, and though Schamyl had lost his strongest fortress and 1,500 of his most devoted adherents, the veneration he inspired was by no means diminished, for his escape was looked upon as miraculous and a proof of his divine mission. He soon assembled another army at Dargo, a village in the district of Itchkeri, and his reappearance in Ichetchenia in the following year caused a general rising in his favor, even among the tribes which had long been subject to Russia and had fought in her armies. It was during the fifteen following years that the power of Schamyl rose to its greatest height and that he displayed in the government of the tribes of the Eastern Caucasus a talent both for civil and military organization which enabled him at the head of a handful of mountaineers to keep at bay for so long a time the greatly superior forces of the Russian Empire.

Schamyl divided the territory over which the doctrines of Muridism had been adopted into districts varying in number according to circumstances, but usually as many as 24 or 25, and each ruled by a Naïb, who acted both as civil governor and leader of the local forces. Each Naïb was obliged to maintain a guard of from one to three hundred horsemen, always armed and ready to serve at a moment's notice. Every ten households in a village furnished one of these soldiers. His family were exempted from all taxation as long as he lived, and the nine others contributed to arm and support him. When summoned to take part in an expedition the Naïb brought with him besides his guard a certain number of the villagers, all of whom between the ages of 16 and 60 were bound to serve. The Naïbs also collected the revenues of the State, which consisted of a tithe of the produce of each farm, of a poll-tax on each family, of a fifth of the booty taken in war and of the fines levied on culprits. These revenues enabled Schamyl to provide for the widows and orphans of his followers, to support the mosques and to maintain under his immediate command a strong body of cavalry by means of which he chastised the tribes which hesitated to adopt his religious ideas or manifested a tendency to submit to Russia; for his flying columns which fell unexpectedly on an insubordinate village to

[4] Fadyeev, "Sechzig Jahre des Kaukasischen Krieges," p. 162.

burn it and carry away the inhabitants into slavery, were more to be dreaded than the heavily laden and slowly moving imperial troops, although the latter were equally merciless towards an insurgent tribe.

In the early part of 1841 Hadji Murad, Khan of Avaria, who had been until then a faithful ally of the Czar, revolted and placed his territory under the influence of Schamyl, who repulsed on several occasions the troops sent by General Golowin to reconquer the province. At the end of the same year the Imam at the head of 15,000 men made a sudden descent on the district of Kumik, to the north of Itchkeri, defeated a Russian detachment and took its guns, plundered and burned many villages, made the inhabitants prisoners, and passing between the Russian columns which were hurrying up to intercept him, brought away the captives, the guns and 40,000 head of cattle. The attempt on the part of the Russians in the following year to take Dargo led to one of the most disastrous reverses which they experienced in the course of the war. The command of this expedition was entrusted to General Grabbe, who, in May, 1842, led thirteen battalions of infantry (about 8,600 men), a larger force than had as yet invaded the mountains, into the intricate and densely wooded defiles of Itchkeri. For three days the troops fought their way towards Dargo along narrow, rugged paths and under the deadly fire of the mountaineers lurking in the thickets on their flanks, until General Grabbe, realizing the hopelessness of the undertaking, gave the order to retreat. Emboldened by their success, the Tchetchens issued from their hiding places and charged the Russians sword in hand, breaking several times through the lines of skirmishers and attacking even the centre of the column, which was thrown into such confusion that the baggage wagons and many of the wounded were left behind and six guns were lost, but were retaken shortly afterwards by a desperate charge of the Russians. Had Schamyl, who arrived only on the last day of the combat in the woods, brought up his contingent a little sooner the entire force would have been annihilated; as it was, it lost nearly 2,000 men.[5]

General Golowin was succeeded as Commander-in-Chief by General Neidhart, a German officer, who adopted at first a purely defensive system of warfare, sending no expeditions into the mountains, but seeking to check the incursions of the independent tribes by the construction of more fortresses. He was not, however, more fortunate than his predecessors; for, in 1843, Schamyl again invaded Avaria, where, in spite of the defection of Hadji Murad, the people had remained loyal to the Russians. He laid the land waste with

[5] Moritz Wagner, "Der Kaukasus," Vol. II., p. 147.

fire and sword, destroying the villages and cutting down the fruit trees, and carried away many captives. In the course of his foray he defeated several detachments of Russian troops, and took nine small forts, but was repulsed with great loss when he attempted to storm the fortress of Vnesapnia. In the following year General Neidhart took the field in person, and Schamyl was nearly surrounded in a ravine in Tchetchenia, but the General, a slow and scrupulous commander, whom the Russians called "the German pedant," lost so much time in placing his troops before venturing to strike a decisive blow that Schamyl made his escape through a pass which had been left unguarded and regained his mountain stronghold.

General Neidhart was immediately recalled and replaced by Count Woronzoff, who was invested with more ample powers than any previous Governor General had possessed, and the army under his command was raised to 150,000 men. Much against his will, but in obedience to the repeated orders of the Czar, he undertook another expedition against Dargo, and in July, 1845, marched with 10,000 men, almost all infantry, by a circuitous route through the mountains which presented fewer obstacles than that followed by General Grabbe. The movement, though accompanied by much loss of life, was successful, and Schamyl, finding that the village could not be defended, burned it, together with the stores of forage and provisions which he was unable to remove. The troops then withdrew, passing through the woods of the valley of the Aksai, where the previous expedition had met with such a serious reverse, fighting without ceasing against the tribesmen and unable to carry away most of the wounded. Had it not been for the timely arrival of reënforcements from the neighboring fortress of Girsenaul the Russians, who had lost over 4,000 men and three generals, would have perished to the last.

As a reward for the taking of Dargo, Count Woronzoff was raised to the rank of Prince, but the power of Schamyl was in no wise weakened by his defeat. In the month of May, 1846, the Imam, having learned that a numerous body of Russian troops was being assembled for the purpose of attacking Weden, where he had fixed his headquarters after the loss of Dargo, issued suddenly from the forests of Itchkeri at the head of 20,000 men belonging to different tribes. He passed through two lines of Russian posts, crossed two rivers, the Sunscha and the Terek, stormed the forts which guarded the pass leading into Kabarda and raided that province as far as the fortress of Naitchich, which is more than 100 miles from Weden. The rapid advance of the Russian troops obliged him to retreat from before Naltchich, but he burned twenty Cossack *stanitzas* and sixty

villages where the inhabitants had refused to join him, and forcing his way through the detachments which sought to check his march, he carried off his plunder and his captives to the mountains.[6]

Schamyl was equally fortunate in the campaign of the following year, when he held the strongly situated village of Ghergebil, which he had taken from the Russians, against the troops led by Prince Woronzoff in person to retake it, and obliged the expedition to retreat after it had bombarded the position and made two desperate attempts to carry it by assault.

During the Crimean War the Allied Powers made no attempt to communicate with Schamyl and secure his coöperation. The Turkish general who commanded in Asia Minor is even said to have rejected his proffered help; but, owing to the necessity for increasing watchfulness against the incursions of the Murids, a very large number of Russian troops which might otherwise have served in the Crimea were detained in the various garrisons of the Caucasian provinces. They could not, however, prevent Schamyl from making a sudden descent at the head of 15,000 Lesghians on the lowlands to the south of the Caucasus in June, 1854, when he devastated the country nearly as far as Tiflis, burned many villages and carried off two Georgian Princesses, whom he exchanged in the following year for one of his sons, who had been made prisoner by the Russians many years previously and was then serving in the imperial army.

A complete change in the method of carrying on the war took place when Prince Bariatinsky succeeded Prince Woronzoff as Governor General in 1856, and the army of the Caucasus was raised to 270,000 men. Prince Woronzoff had already seen the uselessness of expeditions which might destroy a few farms or villages, but could produce no permanent effect on the mountaineers, and he sought to isolate the different tribes, and thus gradually bring about their submission by cutting roads through the forests and augmenting the number of *stanitzas* and block-houses. Many advantages had been already obtained by these innovations, but the still greater energy of Prince Bariatinsky brought the war to a close in the course of a few years. The annual expeditions into the mountains had taken place previously only in summer, and the troops had then returned to their winter quarters, thus giving the mountaineers time to rest and to prepare for a new campaign. But the Prince saw the necessity of carrying on the war by a slow but sure and continuous advance, as though he were reducing a fortress, and therefore decided that there should be no interruption in his military operations and that the troops should fortify and hold permanently every com-

[6] Moritz Wagner, "Der Kaukasus," II., p. 168. Bodenstadt, "Die Völker des Kaukasus," II., p. 456.

manding position which they took; penterating thus, little by little, into the heart of the most remote districts, where the inhabitants, as yet unassailed by the Russians, were less warlike than those who dwelt on the frontiers, and who were always under arms. Greater development was also given to the network of roads which by opening up the forests of Tchetchenia rendered every part of the district accessible, and enabled General Jewdokim by a series of rapid marches which threw the Tchetchens off their guard and turned their positions, to force the inhabitants of Greater and Lesser Tchetchenia to abandon their dwellings in the depths of their forests and settle in the plains on the banks of the Sunscha and of the lower Arghun. Schamyl made desperate efforts to break through the toils which the Russians were gradually drawing more closely around him. His emissaries excited a revolt in the rear of the Russian forces among a tribe which had been subdued since many years; but it was speedily suppressed. He attempted to surprise the fortress of Wladikawkas, but the Russians were on their guard and he was driven back into the mountains. In the meanwhile a Russian column coming from the direction of Tiflis invaded the provinces to the south of Daghestan, and overcoming the obstinate resistance of the inhabitants and the difficulties presented by the nature of the country, laid the land waste and destroyed in a few weeks forty strongly situated villages and three fortresses.

At the same time General Jewdokim seized the long and narrow ravine leading up into the mountains of Daghestan, whence issues the Arghun. He made a road along it which was defended by forts, and according as the Russians advanced the Tchetchen tribes living in the mauntains, who were already discontented with the despotic rule of Schamyl, revolted against Muridism, expelled their Naïbs and Mollahs and submitted to the Czar.

It thus became possible in March, 1859, for the Russians to renew the attack on Weden, which had been strongly fortified. It was defended by 7,000 men under the command of one of Schamyl's sons, but after a short bombardment the outworks were taken and the town was then set on fire by the garrison and abandoned. The result of this victory was the immediate submission of the few Tchetchen tribes which had not as yet surrendered. Daghestan, with its warlike and fanatical population, alone remained faithful to Schamyl, and at the end of July that province was at last invaded. An army of 25,000 men led by Baron Wrangel advanced from its northern frontier and 7,000 under Prince Melikoff invaded it from the south, passing through districts where no Russian soldier had ever been seen. Smaller columns guarded the flanks of these two main bodies and brought the total number of troops employed up

to 40,000. Schamyl, bewildered by this unexpected mode of attack, made but a feeble resistance. His strongest positions were turned and taken almost without fighting. Tribe after tribe abandoned his cause and hastened to offer its submission to the nearest Russian General, and the Imam at last, together with a few hundred Murids, took refuge on Mount Gunib, in the district of Andabal.

The Russian columns soon closed in round this enormous mass of rock which stands isolated in the midst of an amphitheatre of mountains and forms a natural fortress. On the summit, which is a tableland of about thirty-six square miles surrounded by precipices, is a small village with farms, woods and pasturages. A single footpath passing through a cleft in the rock leads up to it. This had been fortified with a loop-holed wall and with a sufficient number of sharpshooters to line the edge of the precipices the position would have been impregnable. The Russian troops, however, during the night of September 5, scaled the heights at two points with the aid of ropes and ladders in spite of a determined resistance, and Schamyl with the few surviving Murids retreated to the village, where, in the afternoon of September 6, he surrendered to Prince Bariatinski.

The Russians treated their heroic enemy with courtesy, but could not accede to his request to be allowed to remain in his native mountains, as his presence would have kept alive the spirit of independence. He was sent, together with all his family, to the town of Kalugha, near Moscow, where the Emperor allowed him a pension of 10,000 roubles, and he resided there until 1870, when he made a pilgrimage to Mecca and died in the following year at Medina.

When the fall of Schamyl had put an end to the despotism of the Murids, and the tribes of the Eastern Caucasus had submitted, the Russian Government immediately brought the entire strength of its Caucasian army, which had been increased to nearly 300,000 men, to bear upon the mountaineers of the Western Caucasus, who were estimated in 1859 as amounting to about half a million, among whom from 60,000 to 65,000 were capable of bearing arms. Unlike the inhabitants of Tchetchenia and Daghestan, who possessed republican institutions, under which all the members of a tribe were equal and were ruled by a council chosen from among the elders, each of the Tcherkess tribes of the Western Caucasus lived under the hereditary domination of one of its noble families, and these feudal governments had long maintained a bond of union between the various races. For more than a century, however, democratic ideas and a desire for greater independence had become generally diffused among the people, and the civil wars to which they gave rise had deprived the nobles of their privileges and their authority, leaving

the tribes enfeebled, disorganized and without capable leaders. Schamyl had come among them in the earlier days of the struggle against Russia to seek for recruits, but without success, and at the time of the Crimean War he had sent to them Mehemet Amin, one of his most trusted Naïbs, to induce them to join his standard; but the Mohammedanism of the Tcherkesses was too relaxed, and they had preserved too many usages derived from their primitive idolatry, mingled with some traces of Christianity, to admit of their adopting to any great extent the austere doctrines of Muridism, and Schamyl's lieutenant made but few converts. The Naïb acquired, indeed, a little influence over some of the tribes, but he was opposed by an emissary of the Turkish Government which was apparently jealous of the power which Schamyl had acquired, and after the defeat of that chieftain he made peace with the Russians and retired to Turkey with a pension from the Russian Government.

A state of perpetual warfare had long existed in the territory to the north of this part of the Caucasus, where the Cossack *stanitzas* and outposts guarded the line of the Kuban. As in the Eastern Caucasus, expeditions were undertaken every summer against some one of the robber tribes. Its villages, built in almost inaccessible situations and strongly barricaded, were taken and destroyed, its lands were ravaged, but no permanent advantage was gained until the adoption of the system initiated by Prince Woronzoff and developed by Prince Bariatinski, of advancing slowly along the course of the principal rivers and of fortifying every point seized.

To the south of the Caucasus, where the mountains descend abruptly to the Black Sea, the narrow strip of land lying at their feet was claimed by the Russian Government in virtue of the treaty of Adrianople (1829), by which the Sultan ceded a province where his predecessors had never occupied but a few seaports, and where their authority had never been recognized by the Tcherkesses. In 1830 the Russians landed on this coast and built fortresses at various points, in spite of the resistance of the mountaineers; but the pestilential climate, the difficulty of obtaining provisions and the incessant attacks of their warlike neighbors soon obliged them to vacate four of the six posts which they had occupied.

When, after the fall of Schamyl, the army of the Western Caucasus had been augmented by the troops from the Eastern division, the Russian Government, having come to the decision of expelling the entire population, either by removing them to the lowlands or by exiling them to Turkey, attacked the mountaineers by columns marching towards each other from the extreme ends of the territory to be depopulated, while other detachments operated in the centre of the line, dispossessing the inhabitants according as they advanced,

so as to drive them, ultimately, across the summit of the mountains and down to the shore of the Black Sea. This system of gradual extirpation lasted for over two years. The smaller tribes, after some fighting, laid down their arms and were compelled to emigrate. The Abazekhs, who were numerous and powerful, consented to make peace and to swear allegiance to the Czar on condition that their independence should be acknowledged and that their lands should not be seized; but, as some members of the tribe did not observe their promises, and as other attempts to conciliate the mountaineers proved futile in presence of their exaggerated demands, hostilities soon recommenced. In this campaign some clans which had not as yet fought, crossing over the mountains from the southern declivity of the Caucasus, fell upon the flanks of the Russian troops, attacked even forts and *stanitzas*, and carried away their inhabitants, but there was no political cohesion between the different tribes,[7] which could not forget their blood-feuds or unite for a common cause. No leader like Schamyl arose among them to bind them into a powerful nationality, and these last despairing efforts of a conquered race were speedily suppressed. Village after village was stormed by the Russian troops; the land was laid waste with fire and sword, and in some cases disarmed prisoners, and even women and children, were, it is said, slaughtered.[8] Some of the more warlike tribes prolonged for a short time their resistance in the rugged defiles on the southern slopes of the great mountains, but the Russian columns, closing in on them from all sides, dislodged them from their fastnesses and left them no choice between transportation to the plains along the Kuban or emigration to Turkey.

The last position to be held was the ravine of Aïbgo, where a band of picked men of various tribes kept the troops at bay for four days until they had nearly all fallen under the fire of the Russian artillery, and by the surrender of the survivors on May 23, 1864, the war in the Caucasus, which had lasted for over half a century, was brought to an end.[9]

For some years before the last champions of the independence of the Caucasus had been subdued the Mohammedan subjects of Russia had, of their own accord, begun to migrate to the territories of the Sultan in such numbers that 500 villages were left without inhabitants by the departure of the Tartars of the Crimea between 1854 and 1863.[10] They were followed by some of the Tcherkess tribes, who fled after the fall of Schamyl, and by the Nogaï Tartars, who

[7] Parliamentary papers. Letter from Consul Dickson, Soukhoum-Kalé, 22d Feb., 1864.

[8] Letters from the same, March 17, April 13, 1864.

[9] M. Ed. Dulaurier, "Revue des Deux Mondes," 15 Décembre, 1865.

[10] Élisée Reclus, "Géographie universelle," T. V., p. 831.

for many years had led a wandering life in the steppes to the north of the Caucasus; and in about four years the total number of these fugitives amounted to 300,000.[11] Fever and dysentery carried off thousands of them while on their way or on their arrival at their destination, but the situation was far more appalling when, in 1863 and 1864, the Circassian tribes began to emigrate in such crowds that both the Russian and Turkish Governments were unable to make adequate preparations for their relief. The population of the Western Caucasus in the latter part of 1859 has been estimated at about half a million, only 76,000 of whom were willing to settle in the lowlands along the Kuban, while between 1858 and 1864 the number of emigrants, according to official documents, amounted to 398,000, and 258,000 of these left the ports of the Black Sea under the inspection of Russian officers in the first six months of 1864.[12]

It is but just to say that the Russian Government, by distributing provisions and money, made some effort to relieve the thousands of outcasts who had been driven from their homes down to the Caucasian coast. It even hired steamers on which they were offered a free passage; but before this measure was taken crowds of fugitives had embarked in small coasting vessels, in which hundreds perished during the voyage from hunger and the inclemency of the weather. Trebizond and Samsoun were the ports where they disembarked in the greatest numbers, enfeebled by the privations which they had undergone, and a large proportion of them suffering from typhus and small-pox. In the former of these ports and in its environs, where they arrived sometimes by convoys of 6,000 a day, their numbers soon reached 70,000; in the latter they were 80,000 in the month of May and 120,000 in June.[13] In both these towns the mortality among the refugees was then at the rate of from 300 to 500 a day. The streets, the market places, the gardens were filled with the dying and the dead, and the pestilence soon began to spread among the inhabitants. The arrival from Constantinople of Dr. Barozzi, the Commissioner of the Imperial Council of Health, brought some alleviation to these sufferings and established some order in the confusion caused in a great measure by the inertia and pusilanimity of the local authorities. Camps were formed at a distance from the towns, among which the immigrants were distributed, but the crowding was still very great, and, owing to the want of proper food and shelter, to the insufficiency of medical attendance and to the neglect of sanitation, there was still a considerable amount of mortality,

11 "Gazette Médicale d'Orient," Juillet, 1864, p. 50.
12 "Géographie Universelle," T. VI., p. 100.
13 "Gazette Médicale d'Orient," Juillet, 1864, p. 57-58.

more especially among the women and children. Large numbers of the refugees were transported by the Turkish Government to other parts of the Empire, but wherever their lot was cast, whether on the shores of the Sea of Marmora, on the banks of the Danube or in the interior of Asia Minor, typhus and small-pox still accompanied them and were spread by them among the surrounding population. According to a letter in the *Times*, dated August 22, 1864, of the 40,000 Tcherkesses who had been settled along the banks of the Danube from Czernavoda to Widdin, 6,000 had died in three weeks, without reckoning those who had perished during the journey thither. The correspondent might well remark: "One cannot help being impressed more and more with the magnitude of the crime committed by Russia; a crime which finds no parallel in ancient or modern history."

A few insignificant Tcherkess communities have been allowed to remain in the higher valleys of the Western Caucasus, but, with this exception, the nation has ceased to exist, and with it the various languages, dialects, legends and traditions which presented so many interesting problems to the philologist and the historian have disappeared, swept away by the resistless onward march of the great Slavonic Empire. The place of the exiles has been taken by colonists from all parts of Russia, especially by the Cossacks, whose *stanitzas* had guarded the banks of the Kuban for nearly a century, and who were moved forward into the lands from which the Tcherkesses had been driven, and it must be acknowledged that this change of population represents the substitution of law and order for anarchy and bloodshed. Freed from all dread of the incursions of the mountaineers, the farms and villages no longer require to be surrounded with ramparts and defended by cannon; the husbandman may sow and reap in safety, the shepherd may tend his flock in peace, and the Caucasian provinces, favored by a fertile soil and a genial climate, and situated between two seas which afford access to the markets of Europe and Asia, seem destined to become one day the most populous and flourishing of the Russian Empire.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

JESUITS AT COURT.

LACORDAIRE once wrote in a letter to Madame Swetchine these remarkable words concerning the disciples of St. Ignatius:

"Tout ce qui m'a tombé sous la main m'a toujours révolté par l'emphase ridicule de l'éloge, ou par l'impudeur du blâme. Il semble cette nature d'hommes ait toujours ôté la raison à ses amis et à ses ennemis. Je voudrais leur consacrer dix années d'études, ne futce que pour mon plaiser propre; mais Dieu nous donne et nous prépare une bien autre besogne, et il faut dire avec l'auteur de *l'Imitation* 'relinqua curiosa.' Des Jesuites continueront à faire du bien, et à le faire mal quelquefois; ils auront des amiu frénétiques et des ennemis furieux, en attendant le jour du jugement dernier, qui sera pour bien des raisons un tres-intéressant et très-curieux jour."

At no time has the world been more occupied with the Jesuits than at the present moment, and the prophecy of the celebrated Dominican above quoted seems more than ever likely to be fulfilled. If their friends are indeed still as extravagant in their praise, as Lacordaire found them, perhaps on the other hand criticism is even louder, hatred more profound, accusation more wild and general. Most of the governments of Europe have banished them on the ground that they are enemies to progress, to liberal ideas, that they have meddled in politics and constitute a danger to the State by seeking to grasp the helm of public affairs, secretly stirring up the nations against their rulers. The subject seems to be of perennial and universal application, since even in this twentieth century and in so tolerant a country as England, people have been moved to some apprehension lest we should be incurring a danger in suffering the Jesuit to live unmolested in our midst. But it is not the object of the present paper to deal with so burning a question as the right of members of the Society of Jesus to exist anywhere; rather would we make an excursion into the domain of history, and inquire what have been the rules and regulations, and what has been the practice of the Society concerning politics in the past, what has been the attitude of its members, prescribed and actual, towards Kings and potentates. Certain facts have recently come to light bearing on the history of the Jesuits at the various German courts in the sixteenth century, and the scattered remains of the private correspondence belonging to the archives of the old Society, before the suppression, have been gathered together. What was done more or less in secret is now proclaimed on the housetops, and the result, as might be expected, is in many ways interesting and instructive.[1]

[1] Die Jesuiten an den deutschen Fürstenhöfen des 16ten Jahrhunderts. Auf Grund ungedruckter Quellen. Von Bernhard Duhr, S. J. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1901.

This correspondence consists of communications between the rank and file and the superiors at Rome, and vice versa, and the letters which passed between the General and the Kings, Archdukes and other reigning princes, ostensibly friends of the Society, but who did their best to put frequent spokes in the wheels of the Constitutions.

The dearth of learned preachers and confessors about the middle of the sixteenth century appealed strongly to the Jesuits to throw themselves into the breach, and thus against the original intention of their founder, they became the spiritual guides of those who made the history of Europe for the next hundred years and more. It was a delicate and an onerous task, fraught with temptations without and within. Ignatius of Loyola, being not less a man of the world than a saint, was well aware of the perils to which he exposed his sons, in sending them forth into the midst of vanities, and having had some experience of courts, he knew that princes love not contradiction. But he decided after mature consideration that after all his "least Society" was created to do a certain work in the Church and the world, the need of which work was only too apparent in the decayed state of faith and morals. It was not by turning their backs on courts that they could hope to regenerate them; but it would be interesting could we discover whether, by a contrary decision, he would have averted some of the odium which the name Jesuit has accumulated during the course of ages.

John III. of Portugal was the first King to demand a Jesuit confessor, and to him Ignatius sent Father Luis Gonzalez de Comara, much against the desire of the said confessor. To his entreaties and objections, the first General of the Society made answer, on the 9th of August, 1552, that he was indeed edified by the humility which caused Father de Comara to shrink from a position which many envied, nevertheless, he was of the opinion that he should obey His Highness in this, as in other things, "for the honour of God our Lord." St. Ignatius went on to say that he need not occupy himself with any but good and pious objects, neither had he reason to fear that the King would, against the will of the Society, confer upon him those honors and dignities with which it was the custom to distinguish other confessors. If, moreover, his remaining at court was a cross to him, he must bear it with patience as he would all else that obedience required of him.[2]

At the second General Congregation, held in 1565, the question arose whether Cardinal Otto of Augsburg might have a member of the Society attached to his court, as theologian. The Congrega-

---

2 Cartas de S. Ignacio 3, 109 sq.

tion decided not to allow any member to reside permanently at the court of any prince, spiritual or secular, or to consent to his following the said court on its travels, either in the capacity of preacher, theologian or confessor, and that no appointment of such a kind should be permissible for longer than one month or double that period at the most. Ten years later, the Provincial Congregation of North Germany was reminded of this decree in drawing up propositions to be placed before the third General Congregation, and it was expressly stated that none but the General of the Society himself should have the power to make such appointments, that they should be made as rarely as possible, experience having proved that more harm was done to the confessor by his residing at court than good to the penitent by his ministrations. The reply to this proposition was to the effect that with the General alone should rest the appointment.

By degrees further legislation became imperative, and the fifth General Congregation, held in 1593, forbade in the most solemn form every member of the Society to interfere in politics or any public affairs whatever. The decree was so absolute that not only did it ensure the imprudent from taking part in the burning questions of the day, but timid confessors were thereby prevented by their scruples from giving counsel when appealed to on matters that could scarcely be supposed to border on politics. In order therefore to correct all misapprehension, the General, Aquaviva, issued an Instruction for the confessors of princes which was formally approved by the General Congregation of 1608. This was considered so important a document that it was incorporated into the Institute, a sort of code containing the Constitutions which St. Ignatius drew up, as well as the decrees of General Congregations. The Instruction was in fact a summary of all previous experience on the subject. It provided, first of all, that in cases where the Society could not avoid compliance with the demand for a confessor at court, great care should be taken in the choice of the individual member to fill the office, so that he might conduce to the welfare of the prince, the edification of the people and the avoidance of all injury to the order. The last clause bore reference to the fact that not infrequently the Society was called upon to suffer in one place for wounds inflicted on it in another. Rules for the said confessor were then laid down, to fit every possible emergency, and in minute detail.

For instance, although attached to the King's chapel, he must not only lodge exclusively in a college of his order, but must remain subject to the rule, like any other member of the Society. Even when traveling with the court, he must sleep in a house of his

order, or if passing through a town where there was none, he must ask hospitality of any other religious community, preferably to passing the night at court. It was again solemnly impressed upon him not to allow himself to be drawn into any secular concerns, which rule the King was humbly begged to enforce. Neither must he accept commissions between the prince his penitent and any of his ministers or other officials. As regarded the prince himself, he was bound to hear his confessor, not merely when he exhorted him on the subject matter of his confessions, but also on matters relating to the prevention of unjust oppression or other scandals which often came about through the fault of officials and were unknown to the sovereign ruler. None might undertake the office of permanent confessor at court without the consent of his Provincial. It was moreover the duty of the Provincial before according such permission to hand these instructions to the prince, in order that he might clearly understand what the Society offered him. The prince was further to be reminded in modest but decided terms that superiors retained the right to the obedience of the individual who became his confessor, as absolutely as to that of any other member.

At first there seemed no great need for these precautions. The Emperor Charles V. chose Dominicans for his confessors, and his successor, Ferdinand, followed his example. But he held the Society in great esteem, and at his death Father Lainez, who was then General, ordered that each priest in the college at Dillingen should offer twelve Masses for the repose of his soul, the lay Brothers to say certain prayers with the same intention. The Society was not only indebted to him for his unvarying friendship, but owed to his munificence the foundation of four colleges, those of Vienna, Prague, Innsbruck and Tyrnau. Ferdinand's son and successor, Maximilian, having Protestant leanings, dispensed with a confessor altogether, but his wife, Donna Maria, sister of Philip II. of Spain, was provided with a Spanish Franciscan, chosen for her by her brother. Maximilian's sons all chose Jesuit confessors, as did also the Queen of Bohemia. At that time the Lutherans thought Catholicism was at its last gasp, and eagerly anticipated the banishment of the Jesuits. But Maximilian, in spite of his Protestant tendencies, was well disposed towards them, and their college at Vienna received many marks of his favor, to the great disgust of his Lutheran subjects. The nobles assembled at the Landtag in Vienna attached three conditions to their votes of supplies for his war against the Turk: the abolition of the procession of Corpus Christi, the confirmation of the Confession of Augsburg and the extermination of the Jesuits. They stated that if the Emperor refused to grant these requests they would refuse the required subsidy for the

war. The Emperor replied that it was his business to repulse the Turks; the other things were not his affair, but the Pope's.[3]

Disappointed in their hopes, the Lutherans, allying themselves to the enemies of the Jesuits in the Church, began to circulate false reports against the Society. At one moment Father Peter Canisius was prejudicing the Pope against the Emperor, at another the whole community at Vienna were guilty of openly insulting the Protestants. Reiterated complaints poured into the Emperor's ear ended by alienating Maximilian from his former friends, and it was difficult, almost impossible, for them to obtain a hearing. But the Empress remained staunch and firm and was perhaps one of those friends of the Jesuits whom Lacordaire would have termed *frénétique.*

Father Maggio, who was then court preacher, seems to have been a man of great prudence and mildness, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of religion. By degrees he not only convinced the Emperor of the injustice of the attacks made upon the Society, but the two became fast friends, so that when he was made Provincial of Austria in 1566, the appointment gave much satisfaction at court. He was frequently summoned to private audiences, and the Emperor treated him with so much confidence that Father Maggio would sometimes venture to address to him written words of exhortation, words that Maximilian invariably took in good part. The Empress, observing the affection of her husband for the Jesuit, would consult him as to the best means of confirming him in the Catholic faith.

When Father Maggio was made Provincial, Father Antonio, a Portuguese, became court preacher, but so little to his own satisfaction that he repeatedly appealed to the Empress and to the General to be released. He bewailed his unfitness for a post requiring so much exceptional virtue, and expressed his desire to be sent to foreign missions. If such were not the will of his superiors, he entreated that he might have some humble office in a house of novices where he might live unnoticed by the world and labor for his soul's health. The General, Father Mercurian, replied on the 18th of March, 1576, that he had no one to replace him at court, and that he must perforce remain where he was. Previously to this Father Antonio had besought the Empress to dismiss him, but she had answered that she counted on his ministrations at the hour of death. A month after Father Mercurian's refusal to remove him he again wrote to the General, begging that he might apply to the Empress for at least a year's leave of absence, during which time no locum tenens would be necessary. Two days later he followed up this letter with another, giving the General his opinion why it was inex-

[3] Orig, G. Epist. 6, 48 sqq.

pedient for any Jesuit to remain at court except for a short term, such as a month or two. There was, he said, no Bishop, ambassador or person of consequence who did not desire to have several of the Fathers about him; the door which after profession they had shut on the world seemed in a certain sense to be reopened by a residence at court; unfortunately, men were not wanting who aspired to such offices, and great inconveniences ensued thereby. Some grew accustomed to a certain independence, little in accordance with the rules of the Society, some were altogether ruined, and brought disgrace on the order. It was perhaps not astonishing that after this letter the General showed less inclination even than before to remove Father Antonio. One who thus appreciated the dangers of the world would be less likely than another to fall a prey to its snares, and was as safe at court as in fulfilling the humblest duties of the noviceship.

But when all was said and done, the influence of the Jesuits at the Court of Vienna was not very great. Their El Dorado was the archducal Court at Gratz, where reigned King Ferdinand's son, Charles II. Here their power was at least supposed to be so great that their enemies declared that they possessed the master-key of all the doors in the palace, and could pass through all the rooms composing the apartments of the Archduchess at will. This, however, and other things she declared to be nothing but lies, *pur lauttere Lugen*, and an attack on her honor.[4] But barring these unpleasant reports the Society flourished at Gratz as hardly anywhere else, and was able to train its novices, give the spiritual exercises and administer the sacraments undisturbed. The only difficulties were in connection with the right of the Provincial to move his men as he chose, the Archduke, like the Emperor, being inclined to regard his confessors as his own property. This was notably the case with the celebrated Father Blyssem, who received marching orders in 1578. The Archduke at once wrote to the General, declaring that Father Blyssem's removal would be extremely inconvenient, and was not to be contemplated. If the General were on the spot he would be of the same opinion. First, Father Blyssem was his and the Archduchess' confessor, whom they wished above all to keep. Secondly, he was not only a vigilant rector of his college, and an experienced confessor, but also an excellent preacher. And finally, he was beloved by all, was well acquainted with the idiosyncracies of the country, enjoyed a good reputation and inspired respect even in the opponents of the Catholic faith. His sudden departure could not but be injurious to the temporal and spiritual welfare of the college as well as detrimental to the general good.

[4] Hurter, Ferdinand II., 3, 578.

But not alone the Archduke, the Papal Legate, Bishop Fellician Ringnarda, O. S. D., also appealed to the General of the Society in the same interest, saying that he had already sought the intervention of the Pope and the Cardinal of Como to prevent the removal of Father Blyssem. As he now heard that in spite of his efforts Father Blyssem was to go to Rome, at least for three months, he begged most urgently that this order might be cancelled, his absence for even a week, to say nothing of a month, being likely to entail serious harm to the Church. The daily presence of the Father was so necessary that if he were not at Gratz he must be sent there without delay. The Legate went on to enumerate all the wonderful qualities of the rector, and ended his letter with a solemn entreaty that the General would on no account remove him.[5]

Thus driven into a corner, Aquaviva was obliged to leave the Archduke's confessor where he was, accommodating matters by making him Provincial of Austria in place of Father Maggio, Father Emerich Torsler replacing Father Blyssem as rector of the college at Gratz. The Archduke expressed himself content with the arrangement, provided that Father Blyssem did not absent himself on the business of the province when he required him at his side.

The new Provincial found occasion in January, 1582, to write to the General about the sermons of Father John Reinel, which were, he complained, too long and too violent. In regard to the first fault, he had somewhat improved, but no admonition had succeeded in making him desist from his biting attacks on the heretics. His Paternity was therefore requested to command him to observe more moderation and gentleness, and instead of handling the heretics angrily and roughly, to teach and exhort them with Christian charity. In this manner he would convert a far greater number, as everybody maintained. But if he continued as heretofore, Father Blyssem would be obliged to send him to another college, where he would have to adopt a different style or take over another occupation. But the removal of Father Reinel was not so simple a matter as at first appeared. Towards the end of the year Father Blyssem again wrote to Aquaviva on the same subject. It had been decided during the preceding summer to send the unmanageable preacher to another sphere of action, because he had been already so long a time at Gratz, and was too much taken up with the court, which he had recently, against the will of his superiors, accompanied in its journey of several months through Bavaria and Suavia, to the neglect of the pulpit at Gratz. His harsh and lengthy manner of preaching was repulsive not only to the Lutherans, but to the Catholics also, but when he was on the point of starting for Vienna the Archduchess,

[5] Orig. G. Epist. 3, 298.

whose confessions he sometimes heard in Father Blyssem's absence, was so much aggrieved at the change that was to be made that she entreated her husband with arguments and tears to prevent his departure. Although the Archduke had made no difficulty on his own account, he begged the Provincial to defer Father Reinel's removal on account of his consort's distress. But the Provincial requested the General to commission him to insist on the change, and to induce the Archduke to agree to it.[6] Sometimes varying reports were sent to the General concerning the behavior of certain Fathers at court. The rector of the college at Gratz had written somewhat harshly regarding the conduct of Father Saxo, who seems to have been a favorite in the most exalted circle. But Father Blyssem in a letter to Aquaviva, dated December 21, 1585, says: "Your Paternity appears to be incorrectly informed as to Father Saxo. In my judgment and in that of other Fathers of consideration, he has very greatly improved in his behavior and intercourse with others. When I was at Gratz last year he was in possession of a costly little alarm which he had received as a present from a nobleman. He was well pleased that the clock should be taken from him and sold for the benefit of the noviceship. The seal which he used at missions, and which he would willingly have kept after the mission, he gave up at the instance of his superior. He had received a great many good books as presents in the course of his missions, to assist him in preaching, and these he delivered up for common use, after very little delay. The Fathers whom I questioned answered that they had noticed nothing in Father Saxo that might give scandal, nor had they ever heard anything of the kind about him."

The complaints against Father Viller were less easily answered than those against Father Saxo. Father Viller had filled the office of Austrian Provincial between the years 1589 and 1595, and in the latter year was appointed rector of the college at Gratz. During this time the Archduke Ferdinand chose him as his confessor. It was not long afterwards that he was accused to the General of being a courtier, an imputation so vague as to need a discursive reply. But his long letter of self-justification addressed to Father Aquaviva is interesting from the vividness of the scenes it lays before us. Its main contents are as follows: "Already fifteen or sixteen years ago, when Father Maggio had left the province, certain Fathers in Vienna complained bitterly to the new Provincial, Father Blyssem, that I had a courtier-like mind, because people about the court came to me and I associated with them. I was, it is true, in favour with the Imperial Council, with the Bishops and the Hungarian nobles, also with the apostolic Nuntios Delphin and Portia, and I

[6] Orig. G. Epist. 23, 325.

laboured to the extent of my power in the interests of religion. Father Provincial removed me from my office, and I became his secretary and admonitor. Two years later, when a visitor, Father Oliver came, he reinstated me as Master of the Alumni, discipline having suffered among them. When I had been other two years in this office I was again accused to the Provincial. I was deposed, but in the meantime the baselessness of the charges brought against me having been proved, I was appointed rector of Olmütz, and Father Provincial assured me with tears that I had been unjustly treated. Five years afterwards I was elected Provincial, and the Father Visitor was able to testify that I suffered much, even to the danger of losing my life, in fulfilling this office in Bohemia and Hungary. The new Provincial (Father Ferdinand Alber) evinced dislike of me immediately on his taking up office, the reason of which was, I believe, merely that we do not share the same opinions. He, like Fathers Bader, Reinel and Scherer, is for daily public penitential exercises in the refectory; I, on the contrary, am for a milder proceeding, such as I have learned of Fathers Maggio, Everard (Mercurian), Gondan, Canisius and Lanoy. Therefore, I am called a courtier, even when I am not at court. The whole college will bear witness that I go there less often than Father Reinel, who at least went there once a day, whereas I go on an average but once a week. If it be objected that I suffer the princes to come frequently to the college, I reply, as I replied to the Father Provincial, that I will undertake they shall come no more; but the responsibility must rest with others. Further, I am reproached with having invited the princes to dinner at the vineyard and also at the college, and that I even played with them at the vineyard. As for the invitation the princes themselves asked to be invited; and the Apostolic Nuntio and the Bishop of Laibach were present at the games, which were, in my judgment, honourable and modest. I have begged to be released from both my offices, in order to remove suspicion and to obtain peace, for I see that I am not agreeable to my Provincial, he having forbidden me to hear the confessions of the Archduke, and even those of the Dowager Archduchess, who like her daughters insists on making her confession to me. If any one has told the Provincial that the college is in a bad state, ocular demonstration will prove the contrary; everything goes on in an orderly way. The Archduke receives Holy Communion every Sunday. He is burning with desire to reinstate the Catholic religion, and he labours for the conversion of the nobility. Only yesterday a man in a very high position was received into the Church. As for your Paternity's exhortation to guard against the spirit of the world, I thank you, but I do not see how I am to do it, unless I flee from the court and

courtiers. I will take pains to satisfy my conscience and obedience, but I fear that I shall not content those who look on the dark side. If your Paternity thinks that I seek the favour of princes more for my own sake than for the Society's, it is a bitter reproach, for I would rather die than be guilty of such a fault. The Archdukes will bear me out how often I have spoken to them on this subject and how I have begged them to write nothing on my behalf to the General or to the Provincial, but they insist that if I lay down the rectorate I must retain the confessorship."[7] . . .

In the end this suggested compromise was effected, Father Viller was no longer rector of Gratz, but remained confessor to the Archducal family. Nevertheless complaints did not cease. He had to defend himself against the charge of clinging inordinately to the worldly advantages of his position, and in a confidential letter to the German Resident at Rome, Father Duras, said: "I call God to witness that I do not value the court and my present office more than any other service my superiors may call upon me to render to the Society. I am cheerfully ready to leave the court at any moment and at the risk of losing the prince's favour, whenever my superior expresses a wish that I should do so, to say nothing of receiving a decided order. I have not so high an opinion of my person that I seek consideration on account of the favour and affection of the prince."

Still the attacks on Father Viller did not cease. Those who were for unmitigated austerity looked on his broad views with horror. Father Scherer, one of the most rigid, called him "the synagogue of libertines." The Provincial and the Spaniard Father Ximenes were among those who judged him most severely. He was, moreover, involved, and this is perhaps less to his credit than any supposed laxness with which he was charged, in the squabbles between the Hapsburg and Wittelsbach royal families concerning the Bishopric of Gassau. This had for long been an apple of contention between Austria and Bavaria, and the new rector of Gratz, Father Haller, in describing the situation to the General, wrote: "Outsiders on either side naturally throw oil on the flames, and as regards ours, I doubt whether they do their best to extinguish them, exercising the necessary charity and prudence. Father Viller does the reverse, blaming and condemning everything Bavarian, while he praises and defends the Austrians indiscriminately. Both parties have their adherents, who publish everything from their own point of view. As this one-sided material is all that is laid before ours, the danger is that the advice given is not in favour of an inquiry. It is taken for granted that all that comes before their eyes is true,

[7] Orig. G. Epist. 35, 479.

and the other side is condemned unheard. But as it is clear how greatly the Christian cause in Germany would be benefited by an union of the two parties, it would be well worth the trouble, seeing the immense influence the Society has over the princes and their advisers, for the members of the Order to labour with more zeal than heretofore to bring about this reconciliation, particularly at Prague, Vienna, Munich and Gratz." He concludes with the wish that not alone the Society, but the rulers of the Church also might advance the cause of union. In a postscript Father Haller returns to his charge against Father Viller, who he declares has disregarded the rules of the fifth General Congregation. At Ferrara, for instance, he engaged in a violent controversy with the Bavarian agent, Sper, concerning the Passau question, as well as that of the Bishopric of Salzburg, which the Bavarians were supposed to covet. Besides this, Father Viller, blinded by prejudice, disapproved of the contemplated marriage between the Austrian Archduke and the Princess Maria Anna of Bavaria, "which he would prevent if he could. In short," wrote the Provincial, "the good Father has extravagant and dangerous notions, and gives no good example to the college."

In his own defense Father Viller wrote that he was by no means averse to the alliance, that he had himself secretly applied for and obtained the necessary dispensation at Rome, and had frequently expressed his earnest desire that the marriage might take place, considering that an union between the two princely houses would conduce to the honor of both, and to the protection and defense of the Catholic religion in Germany. Only, the health of the bride must be considered, no less than her great and notable piety, as it was necessary to provide for the continuation of the line of the august house. He had thought that as marriage was so delicate an affair, foresight was needful, in order that no want of physical health and beauty might in course of time change affection into aversion, such as was to be daily observed in the marriages of so many illustrious persons. This, Father Viller declared, was his whole mind on the subject, and such as he had in all humility expressed it to the Prince. With his whole heart he wished both exalted personages the tenderest love, firm union and continuous happiness. He believed that the Archduke Ferdinand could not form a more suitable alliance with any other family in Europe, but at the same time no one should quarrel with him (Father Viller) for wishing that the bride might possess sufficient corporal health and beauty to ensure the well-being of their issue, and the continuance of conjugal affection. For this reason he trusted in the great piety and noble character of the Duke and Duchess that they would not endanger the

future of their daughter and that of her children as well as the happiness of their prospective son-in-law by concealing a want of health on the part of their most devout and admirable daughter.[8]

But Duke William of Bavaria was deeply offended with Archduke Ferdinand's confessor, and even after the wedding, which took place on the 23d of April, 1600, at Gratz, Father Viller having indiscreetly reopened the subject, complaints of him reached the General. But in spite of all this he did not lose the Archduke's favor, and retained his full confidence to the end.

An incident connected with the jealousy with which the Society guarded its rule of non-interference in politics is furnished by the same Father Viller, who in 1599 was appointed to travel to Rome on a mission from the Austrian Archduke. On this occasion Father Aquaviva wrote to Father Viller as follows:

"As at the present time general suspicion is aroused, especially in Venice, by any semblance of politics, it will be difficult to avoid remarks when it is seen that your Reverence is charged with an embassy from the Archduke to the Pope. And as the good Prince has deserved so well of the Church and of the Society, and especially as your Reverence has resisted so long, excusing yourself in prudent and religious fashion, it appears to me that a *via media* is possible, and an exception may be made. That is to say, if the embassy has nothing whatever to do with politics, but has merely regard to matters of faith concerning heretics or the Turks, your Reverence is at liberty to undertake it, and may set out as soon as is desired. But if the business is a political one, you must entreat the Archduke, appealing to his love for the Society, to send some one more suitable in your place. This will be better for the Archduke himself and will confer a benefit on the Society."[9]

It cannot be denied that during the reigns of the Archdukes Ferdinand, Charles and Rudolph, the Court of Gratz was a model of purity, honor and activity. As the Jesuits were all powerful there at this period, it is obvious that these good results must in a large measure be attributed to their influence.

The introduction of the Society into Innsbruck was the work of the Emperor Ferdinand, and the first Jesuit to labor in this new field was the Tyrolese, Father Charles Grim. At Innsbruck, in 1561, lived the five so-called Queens, daughters of the Emperor, who lived a semi-religious life and desired to be confessed, directed and preached to by members of the Society. In 1563 the Emperor

[8] The reports as to the condition of the Princess Maria Anna's health appear not to have been unfounded. Hurter mentions her delicacy, and Koch says that she was unhealthy. She died on the 8th March, 1616.

[9] Ad. Austr., 1573-1600.

paid a visit to his daughters and inspected the new college. He expressed his satisfaction with it and presented the Fathers with a garden. The five "Queens," Magdalen, Margaret, Barbara, Helena and Joanna, had a great reputation for piety and charity. A young girl who had received severe injuries from a fire was received into their palace and nursed with the most loving care. Certain persons were charged by them to inform them of cases of need as they arose. Father Edmund Hay told the General that three of the Queens had dedicated themselves to God by a vow, and had resolved to remove as soon as possible from the turmoil and luxury of the court into greater solitude. One of them was especially pious, frequented the sacraments once a month and oftener, and would practice very great austerities if her confessor would allow her. In 1565 people declared that the court of these Archduchesses was almost like a convent; every sign of pomp and splendor had disappeared, and humility and modesty reigned in their stead. On the 11th of January, 1566, Father Dirsius wrote to the General, St. Francis Borgia, on behalf of the "Queens" Magdalen, Margaret and Helena, telling him that their brothers, the Emperor and the Archdukes Ferdinand and Charles, fully concurred in their making the above mentioned vow. They had wished, he said, to remove to Munich with their attendants, and to live there in a convent of Poor Clares, apart from the world. But this their brothers opposed, desiring them to remain in Austria. The Emperor had even offered them deserted convents in Carinthia, but in those parts there were too many heretics to please the Princesses. All advised that they should remain in Innsbruck, where they already edified the faithful by their virtuous example and prevented apostasy. They themselves were willing to remain; at least they wished to be in a place where there was a college of the Society, and were thinking of taking the newly-built Franciscan convent, the Italian Franciscans being unlikely to remain on account of the climate and the difficulties of the language. In case they did not get possession of this convent they had also in view a house near the college, and should both prove unattainable, they would be obliged to take a house in the neighborhood of Innsbruck. In this event they humbly begged for Fathers to direct them spiritually and undertake the care of souls in the place.

In answering this letter Father Borgia said that the Society was ready to help the Archduchesses spiritually if only out of gratitude to their father and brother, but that it was contrary to the Institute for the Fathers to live for any length of time apart from their colleges or houses. It would in any case be displeasing to the Fathers themselves to forego the company and edifying example of their religious brethren. It seemed therefore advisable that the three Queens

should take up their abode where there was a college or house of the Society, and preferably in Innsbruck, where they might inhabit the house built by their father or some other of the same kind, and where they might observe their prescribed rule of life and keep the vow they had made to God. The Fathers might hear the confessions of the three Princesses and preach to them. A proviso was afterwards made that in the event of the Queens founding a convent the Fathers should no longer be their confessors, as this would be directly contrary to the Institute. The General then sent Father Canisius to Innsbruck to arrange matters, and he formulated the opinion "that ours should not easily receive permission to direct women, even the most exalted in position, for we have experienced to our detriment and that of this college that ours are liable in this manner to suffer in their vocation, and as a consequence to become unbearable."[10]

The next year (August 16, 1567) Father Canisius repeated his apprehension: "I consider it extremely difficult to keep Fathers who are bound to the court in obedience and religious discipline."

Meanwhile the Queens had chosen Hall, a little town in the vicinity of Innsbruck, as their residence. Father Dirsius announced the fact to Father Borgia as follows: "The Queens have purposed for years to withdraw from the world. Now, with the consent of their brothers, they have decided to reside at Hall, and there with some of their ladies and attendants who wish to imitate them, to lead a religious life in common, but without adopting a habit or the rule of any order. They need priests, however, and wish for members of the Society. They beg therefore that the church to be built at Hall, with all its treasures, may be taken over by the Society, for which they also wish to found a novitiate there."

But Father Borgia again objected, foreseeing nearly all the difficulties which arose later on. The Society might not undertake the direction of a community of women, although these might not be leading a regular conventual life. It was not advisable for the Fathers to accept the church offered to them in Hall, because the college they were to establish in that place would have its own church connected with it, which would suffice. Moreover, it was not convenient that a church communicating with the house where the Princesses lived with their suite should be handed over to them, and lastly it was not the custom for the Fathers to go daily from their own to another church at a distance to conduct divine service there. The General concluded his letter with the remark that as the project of the Queens was directly opposed to the Institute, nothing further need be said about such a foundation.

[10] Kroess., a. a., p. 177.

In a second letter he instructed Father Canisius to impress upon the Queens that they should be content with the confessor which the Society chose as the most suitable for them. Canisius was then to suggest Father Lanoy, whom the General was sending to Innsbruck from Austria, the Empress having been very well contented with him. If they demurred, it was to be represented to them that it was not becoming for "ours" to frequent palaces so much. The less frequently they were seen there the better, and the less people testified their affection by sending them food and clothes, the better would they be enabled to live a community life and observe the Institute. The better also would they be able to render spiritual service.

Father Borgia communicated this instruction to the rector of Innsbruck also, and said he feared that the Fathers were too much spoiled by presents from the Queens, who were in the habit of sending meals daily from the palace to the college. In answer to the rector's question as to what was to be done with the food, the General replied that it was to be given to the sick or to those who needed it more. It was to be wished that the Queens might be persuaded to send no more such things. If they desired to give an alms to the college they should do so in a more useful way. On no consideration should the Queens' confessor take his meals in his own room; sickness being the only exception to this rule.

It was some time before the Princesses could be induced to give up sending delicacies to their confessors, two lagnais being daily employed in carrying the various dishes from the palace to the college. At last, however, the unwelcome favors were stopped by the rector declaring that the dinners thus sent did not reach the destination intended, but were distributed to the sick and other members of the community, the Queens' confessors partaking of the ordinary fare. But they gained their point as regarded the other matter, for in the end the General gave an unwilling consent to their choosing their own confessors, but he wrote to Father Canisius that this arrangement only held good for the life-time of the Queens, and was to be no precedent. After their death the Society would not continue to direct the community of ladies which they had founded, such work not being in accordance with the rules of the Institute, which in this particular also had been approved by the Holy See.

In order to make sure of having the Jesuits permanently as their directors, the Queens had determined to found a novitiate at Hall, and to offer it to the General. St. Francis Borgia accepted the offer, but o ncondition that no responsibility was to accrue to the Society respecting the future of the community, and he wished it to be impressed on the Queens how much he had condescended in allowing

their confessors to associate so frequently with the Court, such frequent intercourse with seculars, especially ladies, being undesirable for religious and giving occasion for idle and frivolous remarks.

Meanwhile the Archduchess Magdalen had given notice that the whole machinery of the Court would be dissolved in six months. Those of her ladies, ladies' maids and attendants who desired to do so might follow her into her spiritual solitude at Hall, no longer as servants, but as companions in the service of God. Accordingly by the end of October, 1569, all was in readiness, and the Queens, accompanied by six of their suite, who had resolved to share their penance, removed to Hall, where they themselves performed nearly the whole of the housework, two servants only being engaged for the roughest part of the labor. Hereupon a storm of abuse broke upon the heads of the Innsbruck Jesuits, who had, of course, originated the whole affair, seeking their own advantage. It was they who had persuaded Magdalen to found a novitiate, and it was their fault that the Queens washed the clothes and plates and dishes of the new community with their own imperial hands, even cooking their own meals. The Emperor, it was rumored, and the archdukes were furious.[11] But the facts communicated to the General by the Fathers at Innsbruck reveal only universal contentment. The Archduke concurred in all that was done, the Queens were brought to acquiesce in the arrangement by which the Fathers were to live at some distance from their house, and the Jesuits rejoiced, inasmuch as they were left free to use the building handed over to them as a school or as a novitiate or to put it to any use they thought fit. Father Hoffäus wrote that the Archduke had accorded him a long and very gracious audience, and had assured him of his affection and esteem for the Society. On the 5th of December High Mass had been sung in their church at Innsbruck, and on the preceding day he had announced a plenary indulgence to all present, on account of the departure of the Queens. The Archduke, the Queens and the whole of the nobility were there. The Archduke had shown himself extremely gracious and kind, had paid a visit to Father George (Scharich), who was sick, and had sent him costly waters. By his kindness he had consoled the whole community. The same day he had conducted the Queens solemnly to their house at Hall, and on the next had left for Prague, when Father Hoffäus had taken possession of the college. On the 31st of January, 1570, the same Father wrote from Innsbruck: "The college at Hall is going on quietly. The Queen scarcely worries us at all; she has not yet entered the house since we went there, and she seldom sends for us.

[11] Orig. G. Epist. 9, 133.

In short, she leaves us in peace, and if this continues, no one can complain of her, except that she generally detains her confessor for nearly two hours after Mass. But this can be borne, as there is no danger, and as I have often called her attention to it, and have blamed her for it, she is now rather more careful."

The following sentences from Queen Magdalen's statute-book show that the continual exhortations of the superiors of the society had made some impression: "Jesuits are to be chosen as confessors. Out of confession none must speak with her confessor unless she has the permission of her superioress, who shall not give leave unless there be sufficient reason for it. For although one may have a scruple or a temptation, she can wait for her next confession, as has been hitherto the wont. An exception must be made for the superioress herself, for it is needful that she speak often with him, but it is not always necessary for her to take him up to the house; sometimes she can talk to him in the lodge or in the lower corridor. They must not make acquaintance with any other of the Fathers or invite them to the house, neither must they send food to any sick Father, except in cases of great need, and only for a short time, say for a week, but not longer. Neither must they give them money daily to buy milk, butter and such like things, but now and again, if necessary, they may give them wherewithal to buy cheese and lard." Nevertheless none must think that she says this out of want of confidence or regard for the Fathers or for priests in general. All her life she has loved them in God and will continue to do so to the end; but there are many things good in themselves and agreeable to God which must nevertheless be avoided, for the sake of a better. If her spiritual daughters avoid exaggeration and faithfully observe her teaching, they will find the Society better disposed towards them, will help them to save their souls and will be less inclined to change their confessors.

But notwithstanding these excellent precepts, there were for years innumerable difficulties about Queen Magdalen's confessor, Father Paul Hezcoväus. He was infirm in health and needed much waiting upon day and night. Moreover, he observed the rule as little as possible, and the Queen took his part against his superior far more than was desirable. It was at last decided that he should be dispensed from keeping the rule altogether, that he need only obey the General and his confessor, and might receive from the Queen all that he needed for his support. But even this was not enough, and sometimes it was debated whether Father Hezcoväus should still be included in the list of those belonging to the college. On the 12th of October, 1584, the Provincial, Father Bader, ordered that the servants of this Father should not have the run of the college and

go in and out as they pleased. If he required anything in the night, the other Fathers should be ready to help him charitably and patiently.[12] But there were still other difficulties at Hall, such as St. Francis Borgia had predicted, and these rose to such a pitch that, in 1596, Father Hoffäus expressed the opinion to the General that it would be better to give up their college there, and so once for all get rid of the burden imposed on the society by Queen Magdalen and her community.

Space forbids further details concerning the work carried on by the Jesuits at Innsbruck, or even the barest enumeration of the obstacles they encountered at the Court of Munich in the effort to abstain from all that did not appertain to their vocation, in the teeth of too much favor on the part of princes. But enough has been said to show that, far from being stereotyped reproductions of one unvarying pattern or spiritual automata turned out of one mould, the Jesuits as represented in their own private correspondence reveal a considerable amount of individuality. The interpretation of the rule was elastic enough to give scope to much diversity of opinion, and if superiors were jealous guardians of the institute, they encountered sufficient idiosyncrasy among their subjects to prevent any rigidity in applying it.

It seems more than likely that if Lacordaire had had his wish, and had been able to dedicate ten years of his life to the study of the Jesuit character, he would have found on the whole that he had, after all, but set himself the very ordinary task of watching a perpetual conflict between a high ideal and that frailty which is inseparable from human nature.

J. M. Stone.

London, England.

THE SEE OF CASHEL AND ITS LATE ARCHBISHOP.

CASHEL, the *Mons Sacer* of Southern Ireland, may be properly regarded as an epitome of Ireland's life, a survival of a great past, a witness for the present. Ireland's soul speaks from its beautiful ruins. Its kingly power, its piety, its exquisite art are all embodied, not merely in the traditions and the hoary history of the castled Rock, but in the stately and regal edifices that still crown it. Cashel is a place upon which the patriot may gaze with mournful pride, and the religious enthusiast with rapt devotion. It is a hill of glory and of martyrdom—a fitting place for a pilgrimage, for it is hallowed with the blood of saints and soldiers who gave their lives to God and country, during two centuries of persecution.

There was something eminently fitting in the association of a personality like that of the late Archbishop with such a See as that of Cashel. The spirit of the past and the spirit of the present—the hopes that were slain and the hopes that have sprung, phœnix-like, from their wrecks, found expression in the junction. The place and the man were the visible embodiment of Ireland's right to sway her own destinies. They stood for the genius, for the unconquerable spirit, for the unbounded enthusiasm for the Cross that sent forth the great monks whose renown lights up the sad era between the passing of the old Empire and the rise of the new Rome.

Cashel was the primatial see of Munster long before the English invasion of Erin. As to the exact time at which the Rock was selected as the site for the episcopal centre of the southern monarchy, nothing authentic is available. While it was still the royal seat a synod was held there by St. Patrick. This was in the reign of King Aengus, son of Nafrach—probably some time toward the latter end of the fifth century. Who the first Bishop of Cashel was cannot be said with certainty; but it is conjectured that it was comprised within the episcopal authority of St. Aible, who was Bishop of Emly, a place only twelve miles distant from the royal city. Ware, in his "History of the Bishops of Ireland," speaks of the obscurity which envelopes the early history of Cashel's see, as well as its successive ecclesiastical edifices.

"Cormac, King and Bishop of Cashel," he says, "is commonly reputed to be either the founder or at least the restorer of the Cathedral of Cashel (which bears the name of St. Patrick, as being consecrated in his honor); and it is past doubt that we have very few traces left of the Bishops of Cashel before his time. The annals of the Priory of All Saints inform us that 'the Church, after the restoration of it, was solemnly consecrated and a synod held there in the year 1134.' But Donald O'Brien, King of Limerick, built a new church there from the foundation, about the time of the arrival of the English in the reign of King Henry II., which he endowed with lands, and converted Cormac's old church into a chapel or chapter house, on the south side of the choir. He also made large grants of lands to the See of Cashel, which his son Donat, surnamed Carbrac, afterwards enlarged by other grants in Thomond; and among other benefactions he endowed it with two islands called Sulleith and Kismocayl. King John confirmed this donation in 1215. About 200 years after Richard O'Hedian, Archbishop of Cashel, repaired this church, which through age was grown ruinous."

O'Brien, King of Munster, had previously given the Rock, with its buildings, to Bishop O'Dunan, and as a consequence it was raised to the dignity of the archiepiscopate by St. Celsus. A synod was held

in Meath A. D. 1111, under the presidency of the Papal Legate, Bishop Gillebert, of Limerick. At this synod legislation of the most momentous character for the Church in Ireland was enacted, and Cashel was represented there, in company with St. Celsus and more than fifty other prelates. The pallium for Cashel was borne from Rome, twenty-eight years later, by no less a bearer than the famous Malachy, prophet, prelate and reformer. He had been sojourning with the renowned Bernard at Clairvaux on his way from the Holy City, perfecting the plans for his great scheme of introducing the Benedictine Rule into Ireland. Malachy himself had been the recipient of a favor from the Pope (Innocent II.) which proved conspicuously the honor in which he was held. In appointing him his Legate, in succession to the Bishop of Limerick, grown too feeble for the discharge of the office, the Pontiff took off his own mitre and stole and maniple and with his own hand invested him with these sacred insignia. Such were the auspicious beginnings of Cashel's archbishopric. The most illustrious saints of the Middle Ages were linked with its birth, and to the piety of the most illustrious race of Ireland it owed its visible origin.

From such a noble initiative results could not fail to be blessed. Cashel of the Kings, as it had been styled from the dim pagan ages, became also Cashel of the King of Kings. Splendid temples began to rear their heads on the summit of the Rock. Examples of that delicate Gothic art that is at once the wonder and the delight of the devout worshipper in religion and art still stand there, despite the ruthless hand of the spoiler, to tell of Ireland's sincerity in faith and art, even at a period of national prostration, when well-nigh all the land had been seared with the fires of an invasion unmatched for ferocious barbarity and wanton destruction. The Danish hordes which had for centuries preyed upon the country had not only overthrown the monuments of earlier art and destroyed the priceless treasures of learning, but had scattered the religious communities that had in earliest days won for the isle, by their preëminent virtues, the title which singled it out amongst all the western regions converted to Christianity for peculiar claims to respect.

The Rock was a refuge for priest and peasant in the fearful days of the Tudor and Stuart persecutions. Its almost impregnable position defied the efforts of the enemy until the terrible Inchiquin, the renegade O'Brien—"Morrough of the Burnings," as he was known and is still remembered by the peasantry of North Munster—appeared as a supporter of the Puritans. He and his myrmidons assaulted the Rock, at a time when it was crowded with refugees from many surrounding towns. The heights were carried and a horrible carnage ensued. The blood of priest and townsman and

tiller of the soil ran in one red stream down the sides of the Rock. It was said that three thousand persons perished in the light of the burning shrines and old palaces of the Kings. Twenty-two priests were among those who were slain. The destroyer had fully justified his appellation ere his sanguinary horde had turned their backs on royal Cashel. They left it a ruin, but they could not destroy what it stood for. This was all crystallized in the career of the deceased Archbishop—in the work which he was enabled to accomplish and in the uncompleted tasks which he has left to other hands.

Three names are especially dear to Ireland in relation to the struggles for national existence, during the past century. They are those of MacHale, Doyle and Croke. The "Lion of the Fold of Judah," according to O'Connell's glowing phraseology, and the not less intrepid "J. K. L." had done great service in demonstrating to Rome that the restoration of Ireland's rapt national rights was not incompatible with the obligations of a Catholic episcopacy, as might have been inferred from the tone adopted by some members of the existing body over the long Veto controversy. The developments of the struggle, in Dr. Croke's later days, enabled him to show the people that an Irish Bishop might with propriety lead a national movement, and lead it better than any layman mayhap, because he could command restraint where the most influential layman might be powerless to hold in check the forces which had been aroused by the bitterness of the conflict.

This is an appropriate occasion to take a glance at the partplayed by some of the earlier incumbents of Cashel's see in the great struggles which convulsed the Western world as a consequence of the Lutheran and Calvenistic heresies.

When the cloudburst of the "Reformation" came in Ireland the See of Cashel was filled by a member of the great house of Ormond. His name was Edmund Butler, son of the Earl Pierce. Some doubt has been expressed as to his fidelity to the old faith, inasmuch as he was found commending the work of the confiscation surveyors, Bellingham and Cowley, in a letter to Somerset, the Lord Protector. But it is argued that the work he commends was something more like social improvement than religious change. His subsequent behavior, when the Lord Deputy took it on himself, without any warranty whatever in law, to order the abolition of everything connected with "Popish idolatry," the Mass and sacred emblems, in the province of Cashel, the Archbishop could not be got, as he was in hiding in Dublin, as Cowley, who was a bitter reformer, complained to his employers. Had he been either a waverer or an apostate, this would not have been the manner in which he would greet the new

régime. Although he did not live to see this vandal order reversed by the government of Queen Mary, yet he died peaceably and was buried in the Cathedral. He was succeeded by Rowland Baron, in 1553—the first year of Mary's reign—who held the see in peace for eight years, at the end of which he died. He was the last who had a peaceful tenure for the next two hundred years. Elizabeth named the reformer, James Maccavill, after the see had been vacant for six years; but it would appear that a Catholic successor, Maurice Fitzgibbon, of the noble house of Desmond, had been secretly inducted and was in possession of the temporalities of the see when the royal nominee came on the scene to claim them. He was obliged to fly for his life, however, as he was accused of having attempted to kill his rival. He vehemently denied this startling charge, but admits in his correspondence that he had insulted him. His flight to France and Spain, where every movement of his was watched with catlike vigilance by the spies of Walsingham, the English ambassador, was said by Robert Ware, the Elizabethan historian, to have been prompted by the Earl of Desmond, who furnished him with letters to the Pope and the King of Spain, imploring these sovereigns to send help to the Munster Irish in their fight against heresy and alien rule. One Stukeley, who kept on constantly playing the part of a pretended friend to the Irish cause, and another spy calling himself Buth, and falsely giving himself out as a Catholic, were provided with letters which brought them to the notice of the Archbishop and enabled them to worm themselves into his confidence. These men incessantly spied upon him, suggested treason to him, and then wrote home stories of their own treasonable plotting. But the Archbishop left nothing in their power, and so Elizabeth herself wrote to Walsingham instructing him as to the means he should take to get the prelate into her power in England so that she might deal with him according to her own cruel pleasure. The Archbishop, she knew, was desirous of being able to return to Ireland, to seek the royal pardon for the crime of having quitted the country without the Queen's permission. She told Walsingham to give him a safe conduct, saying: "But if you find he intended to trick you, as we perceive from your letter you have some suspicion of, then you will act very differently with him, first trying to get out of him what knowledge you can, and then collecting all the facts and reasons you are able to make out against him, and exert every possible means with the King . . . that he should be delivered up to you as a traitor and a known rebel." This passage from the Queen's own letter to her ambassador is extremely valuable, not only for the light in which she did not hesitate to place herself before her agents, but as a revelation of the beginning of a policy that has from her day down

to our own prevailed in the methods of governing Ireland. It will be observed that the first steps taken were towards tempting the Archbishop into undertakings undoubtedly treasonable, from an English point of view, then drawing him on with the false hope of procuring pardon for his fault and immunity in case he returned to his own country, and on getting him to say something which might furnish the basis for a demand for his surrender by the French government. The procedure bears a striking resemblance to that of which the unhappy Scottish Queen was the victim. It stamps Elizabeth as one of the most odious beings that ever sprang from a sinful amour. The ferocity of a tiger blended in her nature with the artful cunning of the fox.

Walsingham tried all his arts, and as he himself says, "in his most engaging way," to carry out the Queen's instructions. But all in vain. He could not get the Archbishop either to commit himself or accept the Queen's pardon unless he had it from herself, over the royal seal; and so the plot was a failure. The Archbishop remained in exile for many years, and according to one authority (Dr. Burke) died in Oporto, about seventeen years after the failure of Elizabeth's scheme. But another historian (Anthony Bruodin, Prague, 1669) sets him down as among Ireland's martyrs. His note on the subject reads thus: "Maurice Gibbon, a native of the province of Munster, in Ireland, Archbishop of Cashel, a prelate endowed with every virtue, was arrested by the Queen's officials for refusing to take the oath of supremacy, and confined in the prisons of Cork many years, where he died on the 6th of May, 1578, after enduring much hardship." If we accept this authority (writing at no very remote period from the time of the transactions dealt with), then the honor of first martyrdom for the faith in the historic See of Cashel belongs to Maurice Fitzgibbon. Another instance was soon to follow—one far more pitiable in its circumstances, more soul-stirring in its exhibition of heroic constancy and superhuman devotion.

Very few definite dates are obtainable about either the appointment of Diarmid O'Hurley, the next Catholic Archbishop of Cashel, or the period when he furtively visited his see to minister to his persecuted flock. Even the date of his birth is not ascertainable. We are only told that he was born, at Lycodoon, a village near Limerick, about the year 1520; that his father was a farmer and agent to the Earl of Desmond, and his mother, one of the O'Briens of Thomond, offshoots of the Kingly line. The youth was sent to Paris and afterwards to Louvain; thence he went to Rheims, where he was made doctor and professor in theology. In Rome he was next found, where the dangerous honor of the archiepiscopate of Cashel was bestowed upon him by Pope Gregory XIII. On his journey toward

Ireland he stayed for a considerable time in Brittany, in company with a number of other Irish ecclesiastics, waiting for an opportunity to slip away unobserved of the British spies. He reached Waterford in safety, but only to meet there the treachery he had escaped in France. A spy named Walter Baal got into his company, gained his confidence by artful means, and then denounced him to the government in Dublin. The Archbishop was warned of the treachery and got away in safety for the time. There is some incongruity in the narratives relative to this portion of his career. One account (Rothe's) would lead the reader to conclude that he was only out of danger for a little while, while another (O'Sullivan's) says, in effect, that for two years he went around in disguise among his flock administering the sacraments, encouraging them by zealous preaching, and fulfilling his sublime duties in the true apostolic spirit. But, however this discrepancy may confuse, there can be no doubt that his period of comparative liberty was doomed to be shortlived. He was discovered while sheltering in the Castle of Slane, under the protection of the Baron, Thomas Fleming, and his wife, Catherine Preston, a devoted Catholic. The Baron was ordered to bring him to Dublin in custody, and was getting ready to comply, when the Archbishop, becoming aware of his danger, made his escape from the castle and fled to Carrick-on-Suir. There he was speedily arrested, notwithstanding the protest of the Earl of Ormond, whose authority was violated in the outrage, and hurried off to Dublin. He was confined in a dark and noisome dungeon for many months, and at last brought before two of the Lord Justices whose rule in Ireland has made their names synonyms for every form of cruelty and illegality—Loftus and Wallop. They began with blandishments. He was offered liberty and "promotion in the Church" if he would consent to deny the spiritual supremacy of the Pope and acknowledge that of the Queen. He refused, with dignity: no temporal reward would prevail with him, he said, to make him deny the Vicar of Christ and the true faith. Then the judges tried arguments; he exposed them as sophisms. They then flew into a rage and called for other forms of argument—the methods of the torturer. He was chained to a tree, and his lower limbs thrust into long riding boots. These were filled with oil and pitch and butter and salt, and a fire was then built under a grating on which his chair was placed. He was suffered to boil and broil over this for more than an hour; and all the frightful torture he bore without the emission of a groan or a sigh of complaint. When it was over he lay down with a serene face and a happy smile on his lips, notwithstanding that the skin was torn from his limbs in great strips, and the fire had eaten into his very marrow. A Jesuit priest named McMorris, a skilful physician,

who had been hiding in Dublin, gained access to the illustrious sufferer as he lay in prison, and by the use of remedies known to him brought him around within a fortnight. But the Lord Justices, hearing of the cure and of efforts being made by the Earl of Ormond to procure the victim's release, determined to glut their ire on one who had so spurned their kind approaches. They ordered him to be executed by the next morning, and at the dawn, so that no passers-by might be witness of the horror. At St. Stephen's Green, at that time a desolate open tract surrounded by a ditch, the barbarity was carried out in all its horrible details of half-hanging, then cutting down, disembowelling and quartering. The martyrdom took place on the 6th of May, 1584, according to one writer; on the 7th of June of that year according to another. The remains were secured by a pious citizen named William Simon and decently buried in the consecrated graveyard of St. Kevin's Church, hard by the place of execution.

There are blanks in the history of the archdiocese, regarding the successors of Dr. O'Hurley, every blank telling its own dumb tale of horror, persecution and the blight of alien rule in unhappy Ireland. There are elements of uncertainty as to the proper succession about this period—for instance, with regard to one Archbishop whose name is given as "Thurlough O'Neill" by Dr. Bray and as simply "O'Neill" by Dr. Renahan. In the biography of Sir J. Perrot, the Lord Deputy, is found a reference to one Archbishop of Cashel in connection with the rebellion of Shane O'Neill, which had long bewildered students of history, but on which a curious light was shed by Dr. Renehan's editor, the Rev. Daniel McCarthy. Wondering at the coincidence of the same name being owned by an Ulster chieftain (Thurlough Liunneach) and an Archbishop of Cashel, who was implicated in the plot to get hold of the leaders in the rebellion by stratagem, he set to work to discover how it could be that a Catholic Archbishop could be mixed up in a matter so unworthy of a great prelate. The theory he offers, as a result of his investigations is not only curious but entirely probable and tenable. Perrot's biographer states that "a Popish Buyshop" was used in the betrayal of the Ulster chiefs, but no name is given; and how "Thurlough" came to be fixed on Father McCarthy thus hypothesizes: "It was thought necessary, though the story rested entirely on that one passage in Perrot's Life, to find in his times an Archbishop of Cashel a 'Papist' and a traitor to the Catholic cause. This apostate could not surely be Fitzgibbon, nor O'Hurley, nor O'Kearney, for the dates of accession, besides their known fidelity, excluded them. Some other Bishop sat then in the interval between the two last; and as a Thurlough, a name intimately mixed up with the dis-

closures to Perrot, succeeded O'Hurley (in *Emly*, not in Cashel) to make Thurlough O'Neill successor of O'Hurley in Cashel solved every difficulty. But we must remember that Perrot's own despatch refers only to a "Popish *Bishop*," and that it is his biographer, writing long after, who speaks of an *Archbishop of Cashel*. Now at the time of the interview between John O'Neill and Thurlough Liunneach in 1536, Miler Magrath, a traitor and apostate, was Bishop of Down, and communicated to the Deputy the correspondence of the O'Neills. This Miler is called by the writer of Perrot's life, not by Perrot himself, *Archbishop* of Cashel, because he was raised to that dignity afterwards. Miler was thus the "Popish Bishop" who betrayed the O'Neills and the "Archbishop of Cashel" who is mentioned by Perrot's biographer. To this ingenious theory of Father McCarthy's we may be allowed to add that its probability is greatly fortified by the reflection, which he seems to have overlooked, that Down, being in the northern province, and quite contiguous to the O'Neills' country, and Cashel far away in the south, it was far more likely that one on the watch for the English interest would gain information of such a meeting of northern chieftains in Down than in the more remote locality.

The epitaph on Miler's tomb, in Cashel Cathedral, lends strong support to the ingenious solution offered by Father McCarthy. It is as follows:

MILERI MAGRATH, ARCHIEPISCOPI CASSILIENSIS, AD VIATOREM CARMEN.

Venerat in Dunum primo sanctissimus olim
Patricius, nostri gloria magna soli.
Huic ego succedens, utinam tam sanctus ut ille
Sic Duni primo tempore praesul eram.
Anglia, lustra decem sed post tua sceptra colebam,
Principibus placui Marte tonante tuis.
Hic ubi positus non sum, sum ubi non sum
Sum nec in ambobus, sum sed in utroque loco 1621.
Dominus est qui me judicat (I. Cor. iv.);
Qui stat caveat ne cadat.

Which is rendered thus by the historian Ware:

Patrick, the glory of our isle and gown,
First sat as bishop in the see of Down.
I wish that I, succeeding him in place
As bishop, had an equal share of grace.
I served thee, England, fifty years in jars,
And pleased thy princes in the midst of wars.
Here where I'm placed I'm not; and thus the case is
I'm not in both, yet am in both the places.
He that judgeth me is the Lord of all (I. Cor. iv.);
Let him who stands take heed lest he fall.

One of the most illustrious holders of the see, during the persecution of the seventeenth century was Dr. David Kearney. The date of his appointment is uncertain, but his correspondence and a reference to him in the "Heliotropium" of his brother, Father Barnabas,

shows it must have been between A. D. 1602 and 1605. He went about in Ireland secretly, fulfilling the duties of his office, from the latter year down to 1618, when it would seem that he was forced into exile. It is uncertain also whether he died in Ireland or on the continent, since one authority avers that he was interred at Bonlieu, while an inscription on the tomb of the family of Nicholas Kearney, on the Rock of Cashel, has been interpreted by some as indicating that the Archbishop was buried in the lot beneath. He was a native of Cashel, and a member of a family long and honorably connected with the royal borough. The date of his birth is not exactly known, but it was believed to be some time in the year 1568. The wealth he inherited must have been unusually ample, since it enabled him to educate himself and his brother Barnabas for the priesthood, and furthermore to pay for the support of a large number of Irish ecclesiastical students in continental colleges. His services to religion were, therefore, exceptionally great, since it was at the time when the persecution was fiercest, and every Irish schoool was closed by the minions of Elizabeth that God raised up this fearless and generous benefactor to fill the void. One of the most noteworthy transactions of his episcopate was the settlement of a long-protracted and painful dispute between the Abbot of Holy Cross, Father L. Archer, and the Rev. David Hennessy, a secular priest, who had charge of the Abbey when the former Abbot was forced to fly from the Kingdom, and who refused to surrender the parish to the new Abbot, who was at last forced to excommunicate the priest. Still Father Hennessy clung to his hold, discharging all its duties just the same as though the sentence had never been pronounced. At the end of ten years it was the good fortune of Dr. Kearney to compose this grievous scandal and make the stubborn priest write a formal submission and beg pardon. The particulars of this memorable transaction are detailed in a beautifully illuminated book, by Father Hartry, a Cistercian friar, bearing the title "Triumphalia Stae. Crucis."

A brother of Dr. Kearney (or O'Kearney, as the name is sometimes thus given), Barnabas, born in 1659, was a member of the Jesuit Order, and one of three of its noble company who came to Ireland about the beginning of the seventeenth century, according to the "Annales Hiberniæ." His companions were Walter Wall (or Wale), of Cashel, and James Everard, of Fethard. The chief facts concerning his brother David's life are gathered from a work of his entitled "Heliotropium; sive Conciones de Festis et de Dominicis." These three were not, however, the first members of the Society of Jesus to visit Ireland, as stated by Carve, in the "Annales." They had distinguished predecessors, one of these being Alphonsus Salmeron, one of the seven companions of St. Ignatius, and the other

Fathers Paschasius Broet and Francis Zepata. This fact is clearly established by the State Papers of England and Ireland, temp. Henry VIII.

The famous Father Luke Wadding for the first time comes into the affairs of Cashel about the period of Archbishop Kearney's death. To his care was intrusted the most important interests of the Irish Bishops and clergy. It is stated, indeed, that all the Bishops appointed to Irish sees between the years 1624 and 1646 owned their nomination to him. He is found favoring the appointment of Dr. Thomas as Dr. Kearney's successor in the See of Cashel. This prayer was granted by the Pope, Urban VIII., and in June, 1626, he was consecrated, at the same altar with Primate McCaghwell. He did not go to Ireland immediately, it would seem, and little is known of his proceedings until the troublesome period of the Kilkenny Confederation, save that he gave money for the establishment of an ecclesiastical seminary in Cashel and offered to maintain an agent in Spain to provide for the mission and schools of the Irish Jesuits in that country. But he played a very prominent part in the stormy events which marked the brief existence of the Confederation. He was in general a supporter of Rinuccini's policy, and on that account got himself into some disfavor with some of his brother ecclesiastics. Still, his name is not less venerated on that account. So complicated was the situation which then confronted the Catholic leaders, between the pleadings of Rinuccini and the intrigues of Ormonde to split the Catholic forces, that no individual prelate could be blamed for following that line which seemed to offer the best hope for the Irish Catholics, independently of what Rome and the Nuncio might think, saving canonical obedience to the Holy See.

The next incumbent of the See of Cashel had not any more placid times before him. He was Dr. William Burgatt, and he steps on the episcopal stage hand in hand with the renowned prelate and martyr, Dr. Oliver Plunket. Both were residing in Rome, the one as agent for the Irish clergy in Munster and Connaught, the other as professor in the Propaganda. Whether both were consecrated on the same day or not is open to dispute; but there is some reason to believe that the ceremonies took place in the same year, *i. e.*, 1669. There is little record of Dr. Burgatt's career as Archbishop, but previous to his consecration he had been largely mixed up in the most momentous concerns of his time, in relation to the affairs of Ireland as affected by English politics and parties. He was one of those whom the noted friar, Peter Walsh, tried to inveigle into signing the document known as the Remonstrance, by which it was sought, on renouncing certain doctrines imputed to them by their

enemies, to conciliate the secular powers and make the position of the Catholics more tolerable. For six days this artful friar labored with all his might and ingenuity in argument to get Dr. Burgatt to sign the obsequious writing, but to no avail. Walsh, after his failure, spitefully wrote that Dr. Burgatt was making a bid for the See of Cashel by his stand against the Remonstrance—a pitiful slander.

The See of Emly was joined to that of Cashel, according to a MS. cited by Dr. Renehan, A. D. 1617, under Dr. Kearney. It would thus appear that it had been vacant for thirty-two years, since this MS. states that the last Bishop of Emly (Moriarty O'Brien, or O'Carroll) "died for the faith in Dublin jail, 1585." The sees were again separated after an interval of uncertain duration, since we find the palm of martyrdom once more awarded the holder of Emly's crozier, in the sanguinary Cromwellian epoch. Dr. O'Brien, Bishop of Emly, was hanged by the dark and ruthless Ireton, son-in-law of the "Lord Protector," on the surrender of Limerick. The solemnity of the tragedy is intensified by the prophetic action attributed to the Bishop as he was led to execution from the place where his doom was pronounced. He is said to have summoned Ireton to "meet him within three days before the judgment seat of God." The summons thus awfully delivered was effective, for within the period allotted Ireton died of the plague, then raging about Limerick. The house where Ireton lodged, and where the court-martial was probably held, is still standing in the city, and is often shown to visitors thereto. It is to be noted that an incident almost precisely similar is related of Patrick Hely, Bishop of Mayo, who, with a fellow Franciscan, a priest, Conagh O'Ruarke, suffered a cruel martyrdom at Kilmallock, in the County Limerick, in 1579 (or 1578, as some authorities have it). The Lord Justice, Sir William Drury, was responsible for their murder. As the Bishop was being dragged to the gallows, after undergoing tortures indescribable, he cited Drury to appear before God's judgment seat, and within three days the mysterious summons was served on him. He died suddenly of some violent malady, his last words being that he was justly punished for delivering an unjust sentence. No one can help marvelling at the almost exact identity between these two episodes of persecution, separated by an interval of more than a century and a half.

The "Rock" continued to be a favorite trysting place for the persecuted and outlawed Catholics. At no time during that melancholy epoch does it appear to have lost its magnetic charm for priest and flock. They assembled there for Divine worship as often as they were enabled to elude the vigilance of the lynx-eyed spies and professional priest-hunters. A group of tourists paid a visit to the "Rock"

early on a Sunday morning, in the penal times, in order to get a view of ruins whose fame for beauty had spread all over Europe. To their amazement they found Cormac's chapel, or rather its wrecked and blackened shell, crowded with kneeling worshipers, and a priest celebrating the holy sacrifice at an improvised altar. A century before had their forefathers poured forth their blood on the same hallowed spot, because of their attachment to the faith to which the furtive worshipers clung.

It is to be remarked, *par parenthese*, that, although the sees of Cashel and Emly are often found vested in the one holder, it would seem that they were never canonically united. This is apparent from the tenor of a letter addressed by Pope Clement XI. to Dr. Butler, Archbishop of Cashel, dated 18th May, 1718, empowering him to act as administrator to Emly. Nothing had been done to unite the sees since that time down to 1835, when Dr. Slattery and Dr. Cullen took some steps to interest Propaganda on the subject, but, it would seem, ineffectually.

The incumbent of Cashel during the terrible period of the "Popish plot," in which the saintly primate fell, was Dr. John Brennan. It would seem that he was appointed about the year 1680, but nothing authentic is found to fix any certain date. The brood of Irish informers busied themselves actively in the hope of getting him into the drag-net of Titus Oates, but without success. Some of these wretches used to try to get information by means of artful statements in confession, thinking, no doubt, to entrap unwary priests into something compromising. Three of these vile creatures—Maurice Fitzgerald, John McNamara and James Nash, describing themselves as "gentlemen" in their depositions—swore out statements intended to implicate Dr. Brennan in the "horrid Popish conspiracy," but he skilfully contrived to elude the bloodhounds, and was enabled to preside over a provincial council held in Cashel in October, 1685, and at which measures of the most important character were taken for safeguarding the faith and securing the systematic administration of the Church. Dr. Brennan was especially active and successful in resisting and defeating a most determined attempt at scientific proselytizing of the people made in his day by the Anglican Archbishop of Cashel, Thomas Hughes; and it was chiefly because of this that his enemies were determined to have his blood. But they never succeeded. He was one of those who negotiated the famous Treaty of Limerick—the violated treaty, as it very soon proved to be.

It is a profoundly impressive fact that during all these long years of bitter trial, when the fang of famine often intensified the sufferings of the oppressed peasantry of Ireland, not one of them was ever tempted to enrich himself by betraying the hunted prelates and

priests. Large rewards were held out as inducements for such perfidy. The direst poverty could not coerce them, the direst threats and frowns of local magistrates of the English "garrison" class were equally ineffectual. It was only among the comparatively well to do that men were found base enough to seek to earn the blood money of the persecuting government, petty squires or impoverished gentry like Fitzgerald and MacNamara and Nash. The families of those who had saved their possessions by apostatizing from the ancient faith were those who furnished the spies and the priest-hunters. Truly the record of the Irish peasantry in those "dark and evil days" is glorious beyond all comparison, and furnishes a tie between Church and flock which no force in all the world is strong enough to shatter or impair.

It was the spirit of that race of ecclesiastics who faced the might of England in that awful time of remorseless persecution that became reincarnate in the person of Thomas W. Croke. There supervened a period when the holders of the see conceived it to be the path of duty for Christ to humble themselves and gratefully give thanks for permission to live. So we find in the annals of the eighteenth century the most dutiful addresses to the English Crown bearing the signatures of the Cashel dignitaries amongst others. They were called upon to "kiss the rod," and they went through the ordeal, as other Irish Bishops found it politic to do. The period of "toleration" was more trying for the existence of the Irish Church, it must be confessed, than the period of the most ferocious persecution. The Test Oath was a sore trial; and so was the controversy over the Veto proposal; yet though faint hearts at times counselled sacrifice of almost everything worth preserving, the principle involved in the resistance to the Veto triumphed in the end. It is hard to blame Bishops like Butler when they wrote: "We preached loyalty and we practised it when every sinew of the disabled and distracted British empire was enfeebled by a log struggle for the sovereignty of America—when the Minister of England was obliged to desire His Majesty's Irish subjects to *defend themselves*—when in consequence of this direction we saw a self-appointed army of ninety thousand citizens, of whom two-thirds were Roman Catholics—when we were invited by every temptation of foreign assistance; when all these circumstances conspired to shake our allegiance, the conduct of the Roman Catholics in Ireland was marked by an exemplary obedience to or an active support of the very laws whose rigors we complained of." These words were written at a time when the country was in a turmoil of disturbance owing to the harshness and overbearing conduct of clergymen of the Established Church, in the collection of tithes and the publication of scurrilous pamphlets against the Cath-

olic system. But the Bishops dreaded the spirit of Whiteboysim more than that of persecution; they saw no refuge from the fury of Orangeism on the one hand and the fury of the French Revolution on the other but in the protection of the English government; and so they accepted insult with gratitude. But subservient as many of these distracted prelates were, the British could never get a majority of them to agree to the Veto. This was the last ditch of the Irish Catholic resistance, and there the old spirit responded to the call from the past to stand firm for that for which the martyrs died.

In the later dismal days after the Cromwellian and Williamite wars, when the Penal Laws were in most active operation, the See of Cashel was the only one which could boast of a resident Archbishop. The dauntless Dr. Comerford was the man. He had been seized and flung into prison, then driven out of the kingdom and compelled to wander a penniless outcast on the continent. Yet somehow he contrived to return to his diocese to look after his flock. For twenty years he had led a hunted life, with the spy and the informer constantly on his track; but not one of his faithful people could ever be induced to betray his hiding place. The charity of the poor was for all this period his only revenue. A memorial in his behalf was presented to the Papal Nuncio in the year 1702, as we learn from Cardinal Moran's painfully interesting work, "The Catholics of Ireland Under the Penal Laws of the Eighteenth Century." It declared that "neither chains, whose rigors he had already felt, nor the fear of living an outcast and a wanderer, nor the hope of finding a place of refuge abroad, nor even the terrors of death, with which he had often been menaced, could ever induce him to desert the flock committed to his care."

Dr. Comerford had a worthy successor in the see in the person of Dr. Christopher Butler. He was the son of Walter Butler, of Kilcash—a branch of the Ormond family that had not abandoned, like its head, the old faith for the sake of the "fleshpots of Egypt." He, too, had to lead the life of an outlaw, so to speak, making his abode in the wild passes of the Galtee Mountains, from whence he could survey the broad lands that had once been the family estates. He died after several years' privation and hardship, having all the time, like his Divine Msater, no place whereon to lay his head, save in the savage cave or the miserable mountain sheeling. Another of the Butlers succeeded him, Dr. James. This prelate for many years led a similar miserable existence, but he lived long enough to witness a relaxation of the fury of persecution. The victory of Fontenoy had caused a change of policy toward the Irish Catholics, and the Government became actually gracious when it learned that Charles Edward was about to make an attempt to recover his father's crown.

To win the favor of the "Papists" in Ireland the courtly Earl of Chesterfield was sent over as Viceroy, and under his judicious rule the trade of priest-hunter became a decidedly unremunerative one. Later on, when affairs in America began to take an alarming turn, Lord North instructed the Irish Viceroy, the Earl of Harcourt, to bring in a bill, in the Irish Parliament, for the purpose of enabling "Papists" to recover money lent to Protestants on mortgages of lands or houses—which under the Penal Laws they had hitherto been precluded from doing; also one to allow "Papists" to declare their allegiance to the sovereign. Although Lord North pressed for the passage of these measures, he did not attempt to carry out the order, so certain was he of defeat in the Irish Parliament (all Protestants) if he tried to do so. But there came more imperative orders from Lord North when it was learned that one of the earliest acts of the newly-born American Congress was to send an address to the Irish people asking their sympathy and support in the struggle against English despotism. As some misconception appears to prevail regarding the relations of the inchoate Republic and the Irish nation at that time, it may not be irrelevant perhaps to deviate a little from the chief subject to glance at this memorable bye?episode in international amenities. The Philadelphia Congressmen said:

"We are desirous of the good opinion of the virtuous and humane. We are particularly desirous of furnishing you with the true state of our motives and objects, the better to enable you to judge of our conduct with accuracy and determine the merits of the controversy with impartiality and precision. Your Parliament has done us no wrong. You had ever been friendly to the rights of mankind, and we acknowledge with pleasure and gratitude that your nation has produced patriots who have nobly distinguished themselves in the cause of humanity and America." This apostrophe, which was addressed not to the Parliament of Ireland, but to "the people"—that is, the Catholics—for these were then, as now, the overwhelming majority of the population—produced something like consternation in the British Cabinet. The bill to enable Irish Catholics to testify their allegiance to the sovereign was the first actual fruit of the panic. This was accepted by the Catholics as a most important concession. It recognized the fact that they had a legal existence—a proposition that was denied by the penal enactments and embodied in judicial decisions. As the eminent historian, Plowden, says: "It gratified the Catholics, inasmuch as it was a formal recognition that they were subjects; and to this recognition they looked up as the corner-stone of their future emancipation."

Under the influence of this salutary alarm conditions for Catholics became so much improved that Dr. Butler was actually permitted

to live in a humble thatched dwelling in Thurles, on the site where the present episcopal residence now stands. Here he resided in comparative ease, poor, but unmolested by the minions of the law, for several years.

It was in Churchtown, near Mallow, an idyllic little southern town on the poetic Blackwater, that the late Archbishop was born, the son of a Catholic father and a Protestant mother. It was in the year 1824. The idea of Catholic Emancipation had not then become anything clearer than a dream, and the same dearth of educational facilities for Catholics which drove the young man who was destined to become the great Bishop England to seek the fount of learning abroad caused the family of young Croke to send him to the Irish College in Paris, after he had acquired the elementary principles of a training in classics and mathematics at Charleville school. He had attracted such attention from the local clergy by his proficiency and his high spirituality of character that the belief in a vocation for the higher life was easily brought home to his circle. It was his own ambition, too. Although fond of those field sports which are the delight of healthy Irish lads, he possessed that indefinable yearning after the hidden beautiful which in the Celtic temperament blends so strangely with the emulation for excellence in the manly games of strength and speed. To "put" the ponderous stone, to fling the hammer, to vault the high fence has been the delight of many of Ireland's holiest priests in the days when they were training for different service in the fields of spiritual renown. Among those young knights of Christianity it is said that none was doughtier than young Thomas William Croke; and it is remarkable that all through his life, and even down to the time that he took to his bed for his last illness, he manifested the keenest interest in the pastimes peculiar to the Irish race and gave them every encouragement in his power; he was, in fact, an enthusiast over Celtic games, and had been the patron of the Gaelic Athletic Association from its foundation. The results of this healthful training were visible in the robust frame and erect bearing that made the deceased prelate a conspicuous figure, whether in the sacerdotal assemblage or in the private gathering. Down to a very short time ago he was always the best living example of the old ideal of "a healthy mind in a sound body," and showed how subtly related the one condition was to the other. It was not only that his walk was firm and his frame straight as a pillar, but his clear complexion and undimmed eye might easily lead those who did not know the facts to believe him to be a man born at least ten years subsequent to the day of his nativity.

Some of those who have attempted biographical sketches of Dr.

Croke have laid such emphasis upon his fondness for field sports and his prowess at them that the reader might really be led to think that this feature of his character was his chief claim to be considered a great Irish bishop. He was what is styled a muscular Christian, no doubt, but he was so in much more than a physical sense. Behind the manliness of speech and action there lay that intense spiritualism which has given Irish hagiology a distinctive note—a harmony with the mystic, a harmony with the voices of the unseen universe, and a harmony with human ideals in the varied field of active endeavor. It is a curious illustration of the tendencies of this particular age that the spirit of the gladiator seems to stir men more than the spirit of the martyr. We can easily understand why such a prelate as Dr. Croke gave every encouragement to those manly sports which delight his energetic countrymen. He understood their temperament, and knew well that in the play of the natural faculties in youth there is always the surest preventative against the inroads of the brood that feed on idleness and introspection.

Six years was the term of young Croke's sojourn in the famous seminary on the Rue Irlandais. He was an exceptionally apt scholar, and during those years he had read and studied with rare diligence. His courses in moral philosophy, theology and canon law were brilliant and brought him much distinction. Having gained all he could from the Irish College, he left Paris and journeyed toward Belgium, with the view of completing his ecclesiastical education. In the little frontier town of Merim there is a college well known to Irish students, and here the young scholastic stayed for a year, accepting a professor's chair and teaching philosophy, rhetoric and the English language. But his goal was not Merim, nor any other place in Belgium. The star of his destiny pointed the road to Rome, and so Romeward he set his face in the year 1845. Three years he spent in the great capital. He read theology under the famous teachers, Perrone and Passaglia, attended lectures at the Roman University, the gold medal of which he carried off in the year 1866. Soon afterwards he finished his scholastic career with such honor that he was accorded the rank of doctor of divinity. It was not long until he was received formally into the ranks of the sacred ministry, thus fulfilling the sanguine anticipations of those early friends who recognized in him the talents and the steadfastness of purpose which are indispensable for the holy priesthood. The irrevocable step now taken, he returned to his native land to glad the hearts of his kin and the friends who had worked and prayed for such a blessed result for many years.

Dr. Croke's career as a teacher and Church administrator covered almost every phase of ecclesiastical life. His experience was of

two hemispheres. We see him going from the Roman University to take the chair of rhetoric in Carlow College, and in a little while afterward he is back in Paris teaching theology in the old familiar school, the Irish College. He was thence summoned to begin missionary work in his native diocese of Cloyne, and after nine years spent in this arduous labor he was invited to assume the presidency of St. Colman's College, in Fermoy. Whilst filling this important post he was made parish priest of Doneraile and also honored with the chancellorship of Cloyne Chapter. The manner in which he bore himself in all these changes and the unmistakable executive ability which he displayed could not fail to make their impression at the seat of collective wisdom. The Holy See had duly noted these things and marked out Dr. Croke for preferment. The Bishopric of Auckland, in New Zealand, was offered him in 1870, and he obeyed the call. It was comparatively new ground, and the work of building it up was arduous. For four years he toiled manfully at it, but it proved too much even for his sturdy constitution, and so he was compelled to return to his native air to rest and recuperate. Shortly after he landed the venerable Dr. Leahy, of the Cashel archdiocese, breathed his last. Exalted and important though it was, the dignity was not thought beyond the merits and the capacity of Dr. Croke, and the venerable Pontiff, Pius IX., testified his esteem for him by personally inviting him to Rome to ask the pallium. This was conferred in Consistory on July 5, 1875.

The Repeal agitation started by O'Connell was at its height when Father Croke, as a young Levite, had first returned to his native land. Into this movement he threw himself with all the ardor of a strong Celtic nature. It has been written of him by somebody who did not apparently know him very well that "he hated England." Such an expression does him an injustice. If he had been described as hating the system of English government which exercised so baneful an influence on the fortunes of his country, it would have been perfectly correct. The quarrel of many Irishmen is not with England or with its people, but with the principle of alien rule. Many good Englishmen sympathize with Ireland, and have no stancher friends than those Irishmen with whom they co-operate for the welfare of the country. Several of those distinguished friends of Ireland had made the acquaintance of the late prelate, and the only sentiments between them were those of mutual respect. But if it were not inaccurate to describe the feeling he entertained toward England as hatred, the circumstances under which he first made his appearance in Irish public life might very well have excused such a sentiment. It was during the period of the great famine of 1846-47. The corpses of thousands of starved peasants strewed his native

county, from Skibbereen to the outskirts of Cork city, and in nearly every case in which coroners' juries had investigated the deaths of these miserable beings a verdict of wilful murder against the British Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, had been arrived at, because of the fact that while the potato crop had failed there had never been a better harvest in other products, and enormous quantities of food had been shipped to England and other countries, while the wretched tillers of the soil, who, according to the moral code, have the first claim upon its fruits, were left to perish without any step being taken by the Government to stop the exportation of food or procure supplies in its place—until too late. These things left an indelible impression on the ardent mind of the young priest, and made him resolve to leave no effort untried to terminate the system of misrule which in the course of a single year had allowed a million and a half of people to perish by the most horrible form of torture.

Bearing in mind the contention of Bishop Berkeley, that were there a wall of brass a thousand cubits high around the kingdom of Ireland, the natives might nevertheless live cleanly and comfortably by tilling the land and reaping the fruits of it, he threw himself heart and soul into the Young Ireland movement, which had just begun to attract the brightest intellects of the country. But any movement which, while looking to force for a solution of national ills, has for leader one of such scrupulous honor as to forbid his forces from taking food from the agrarian population save for immediate payment, must necessarily fail in so poor a country as Ireland; and so it was that the chivalrous leader, William Smith O'Brien, soon beheld his motley army dwindle away and was forced to make the show of aggression which eventuated in the fiasco of Ballingarry. It is probable that the lesson of the failure was not lost upon Father Croke, for, though he did not cease to take a part in the political struggles of his country, he was found later on supporting those enterprises which looked to its liberation by means of constitutional movement rather than to the outcome of an armed struggle wherein the odds would be so unequal, as in the case of Ireland against the British Empire.

If any change took place in his views as to means for effecting his country's liberation, he never altered his belief that such an object was worthy of heaven's blessing. But in order to secure that blessing, he believed it should be sought with clean and blameless hands. Now, here was the very difficulty which had so often brought perplexity and confusion to the most devoted lovers of their country in the past. In all political agitations there is the danger of a certain ungovernable element. When Emmet led forth his forlorn hope

against the walls of Dublin Castle, the cause of noble enthusiasm was stained with the murder of a most upright and respected Judge, Lord Kilwarden. This shocking tragedy diverted sympathy from Ireland's cause in the breasts of many. So in previous years the excesses of the Whiteboys and similar secret organizations, even though they were provoked by intolerable oppression, brought shame to the cheek of those who loved their country not less than those midnight insurgents; but loved it more wisely.

As the Irish Bishops were compelled by their duty as well as their own love of country to denounce the system of midnight outrage in the previous century, so Dr. Croke and his brother prelates were impelled by conscience to repudiate and condemn certain developments of the Land League agitation in the early years of that movement. But this fact did not alter his allegiance to the principle of Irish nationality. He was in this, according to his own expression, "unchanged and unchangeable." But what he would have highly he would have holily, or not at all. When we remember that in the '48 movement, along with him, ardent men who would not hesitate, as John Mitchel avowed for himself, to use the fire of hell, if it were possible, to make war on England for Ireland's liberation, we may form some conception of the perplexities of Dr. Croke's position at various phases of his long connection with Irish politics. Yet the pole star of duty always pointed, clear and unmistakable, to the course he was to follow.

After the failure of the insurrectionary movement in 1848 the hope of Ireland seemed for the first time to have been crushed irretrievably. Gavan Duffy tersely described the country's condition when, on leaving her shores for the antipodes, he said he "left her a corpse upon the dissecting table." Dr. Croke does not seem to have ever despaired of the principle of life in that apparently inanimate body. There arose a small party, led chiefly by the late Isaac Butt and the late Sir John Gray, whose programme was "tenant right," based on the "Ulster custom" or, as it was styled, the "three f's"—fixity of tenure, free sale and fair rents. The evolution of this modest idea into the formidable Land League programme, whose ultimate aim is the rooting the tiller of the soil in the land as its owner as well as its cultivator, is an absorbing chapter in politico-economic history. It is only just to say that the masterly expositions of the law of tenant-right which were drawn forth from the great lawyer, Isaac Butt, were instrumental in opening the eyes of many to the grievous wrongs under which the Irish tenant-farmers groaned, and enabled acute minds like Dr. Croke's to grasp the possibilities for a resuscitation of Irish national effort which the problem of land tenure presented.

In the consideration of Dr. Croke's career as an Irish politician as great an injustice seems likely to be done him as in the case of his idiosyncrasies in the matter of field sports. Those who will persist in judging of individual character by peculiar traits fail to grasp the homogeneity of a great man's life. Such things were in Dr. Croke's mind only the incidental means toward one great ennobling end. The revival of the glories of a classic Hellas was not half so definite or so practicable in appearance as the possibility of a revivification of Ireland's nationality and renown to sublime enthusiasts like the Archbishop of Cashel. It was impossible that it could be otherwise. There was a glamor in the atmosphere of his royal see. The spirit of a mighty past brooded irremovably above and around it. He looked upon ruins whose very silence was thrilling with incitement to action. They spoke of glorious days when Ireland's Church and Ireland's nationality clasped hands in a mighty struggle for freedom. They told of still brighter days when the genius of the artist was consecrated to the service of religion and the spiritual life of Ireland found expression in architectural beauties that not even the destructive hand of the vandal nor the ravages of time have been able to deprive of their wizard charm. The Irishman, cleric or lay, who, knowing aught of his country's past, could stand on the hill of Cashel and gaze unmoved on the majestic relics of its grandeur and faith has yet to be born.

When the Land League movement was started there was imminent danger of another Irish famine. The crops had failed over wide areas of the country, and the law of self-preservation urged the people to respond to the summons of the leaders of the new movement. Dr. Croke had for nigh twenty years kept aloof from the field of politics, seeing no prospect of any relief in the dreams of the physical force party, and discouraged by the collapse of the Home Rule and tenant-right movement led by Isaac Butt. Now at last he saw the dawn of a new hope, and he grasped at it with all the ardor and energy of a spirit long pent up within artificial restraints.

To a good many estimable people the name of the Land League suggests only a reproduction, on a different theatre, of the French uprising against the aristocracy and differing only from the Reign of Terror in degree. Such sensitive souls can have no true conception of the conditions which preceded the formation of this defensive combination, for else they would not be so disposed to condemn the peasantry for turning at last against their hereditary oppressors. In the "Tale of Two Cities" there is a picture of the French peasantry under the feudal system, previous to the Revolution, which makes the blood tingle with indignation and sympathy for the victims of the tyranny. France was not alone in this condition of social misery.

There was hardly a feature of the degrading side of feudalism which the Irish tenant-farmer was not made to feel, while totally excluded, at the same time, from the beneficent and redeeming concomitants of the system—as, for instance, the responsibility of the feudal lord for the material welfare of his vassal. He could not be turned out, like the Irish cottier tenant, to die in the ditch; he must give him a roof and food, come what might. If any one take the trouble to read the evidence taken by the Land Commission, before Mr. Gladstone framed his first Land Act, he will find many of the loathsome features of the French system in existence on the big Irish estates nearly a century after France had swept it away. On very many of these estates the tenantry were not allowed to marry without the consent of the agent; on some it was said that even the custom known in France as the "droit du seigneur" was sometimes insisted on, and there was testimony given at least in one case, a Kerry estate, where a poor farmer's wife going to beg the agent for a reduction of rent, was informed by him that she could have it only at the price of her honor. In other features the landlord system was far more iniquitous than anything that ever grew up out of the feudal bond. Every improvement which the tenant made on the land or in his cottage added to the value of the property, and led the landlord to place an additional rent on that very farm—a punishment, in other words, for the virtues of industry and progress. If he fell into arrears, the landlord swooped down, backed by the minions of the law, and cast him and his family forth on the roadside, confiscating at one blow all the improvements he had made on the holding, and consigning the victims of rapacity, practically, to death and despair. Some conception of the magnitude of the ruin which extortionate landlordism worked in Ireland, in those woful times past, may be formed from the legal statistics of the period. The number of ejectment decrees taken out by the various landlords at the quarter sessions throughout the country, for the year 1879-80, when famine appeared imminent, was 16,626. Five persons are usually allowed for the family ratio in Ireland, and on this basis the number of individuals sought to be evicted in the lattter year was over 84,000. Were it not for the starting of the Land League the holocaust would have been made. Many families were thrown out as it was, but the action of the League prevented many more from having to follow.

Such were, briefly, the causes which led to the formation of the Land League. Before the tenant-farmers had this friendly beacon to look to, many a one took the law into his own hands and shot down the tyrant of his fields or the agent, just as opportunity offered. Tipperary was the scene of many a tragedy, and Dr. Croke knew better perhaps than any man that unless the hot-blooded peasant of

that region saw some prospect of amelioration in his intolerable condition the "wild justice of revenge," as landlord assassination was termed, must continue to claim its victims and make men criminals who otherwise would be the most guileless and upright of human beings. These were the reasons which induced him to espouse the new agitation with all the warmth of his great Irish heart. He did not do so, however, until he was sure of his ground. Mr. Parnell at first looked askance at the movement begun in a very modest way by Mr. Davitt, but it was not long ere his astute political vision enabled him to see what vast possibilities it presented as an auxiliary to the larger Home Rule plan which he had been propounding with partial success. He hastened to Thurles and laid his views before the Archbishop with all the calm and logical deliberation of a statesman. He soon convinced his listener that the plan meant the salvation of the Irish tenants, and from that moment Dr. Croke became a steadfast and enthuiastic supporter of it. Thurles became the stronghold of the League, and its Archbishop its fearless standard-bearer.

It was not to be expected that such a position could be assumed and maintained without bringing calumny and obloquy to him who sheltered the harried tenant behind the episcopal robe. The Vatican became the theatre of petty intrigues by the hangers-on of the British Government, and as a result Dr. Croke was summoned to Rome to explain his attitude in promoting the Parnell testimonial. He defended his action with great ability, but, with the whisperings of the English intriguers in his ears, the venerable Pontiff was led into the tactical mistake of condemning the idea of a testimonial. Nettled by this interference in what they conceived to be merely their political affairs, the Irish National party appealed to the people to prove their confidence in Mr. Parnell, with the startling result that the original sum intended to be subscribed as a testimonial to him was doubled. Forty thousand pounds, instead of twenty, was made up within the course of a few months.

Yet this unmistakable proof of the disposition of the Irish people did not deter the intriguers at the Vatican. They still kept up a pressure on the Pope to induce His Holiness to denounce the ways of the League, and the opportunity came when as a retort to a new outburst of coercion in Ireland, the imprisoned leaders issued the "no rent" manifesto, and later on, after the failure of this attempt, when certain prominent members of the League, without the knowledge of Mr. Parnell, originated the strike against excessive rents, on the lines laid down in the document known as the "Plan of Campaign." Briefly, this plan proposed that the tenants, and not the land courts or the landlords,

were to determine what amount of rent they should pay. Those on any given estate which was believed to be rack-rented were advised to assemble, consider the harvest conditions and their own family responsibilities, determine what amount of rent they could pay, after making due provision for themselves, put the collective sum into the hands of a chosen trustee, and through him offer it to the landlord. If he refused to accept it as satisfaction in full for that year's rent, and instituted legal proceedings to recover his full claim, the costs of such proceedings were to be deducted from the amount lodged in the trustee's hands. This was the line of action which the Holy See condemned as immoral, as it had previously condemned the "no rent" manifesto. In extenuation of the course pursued by those responsible for both these acts of the League, it is only just to say that whereas the strike against all rent was advised, not as a permanent but only a temporary measure, designed to put a stop to the wholesale imprisonment begun by Mr. Forster, the Chief Secretary, acting in the interests of the landlords, the "plan of campaign" was determined on for a somewhat similar purpose a few years later, when there was a renewal of coercion methods. When weighing the moral issues involved in these momentous proposals it should not be forgotten that the position assumed by the tenantry as a basis for recalcitrant action, that they were being asked to pay more than the land yielded in return for their labor and outlay, has invariably been sustained by the decisions of the Land Courts, given upon the advice of Governmental valuators, from the time of the passage of the first Land Act until now.

The Irish episcopate were the best judges of the questions at issue between the Irish people and the Irish landlords, and were it not for their preëminently prudent action during those eventful years, so embittered became the mental attitude of the populace toward the Holy See that there needed but a single error of judgment on the part of the episcopacy to provoke a revolt that might have proved incurable. Archbishop Croke and Archbishop Walsh, of Dublin, at this critical juncture, stood as twin ramparts against a rising floood of anger and misunderstanding. When the Land League said: "No rent," the former at once put his foot down firmly in denial. He told the Leaguers that they were giving immoral advice, and this resolute action caused the mandate of the League to fall flat, in a great measure. Dr. Walsh's appointment to the See of Dublin was a pledge that the Holy See regarded the Home Rule movement with approval; and that eminent prelate lost no opportunity of undoing whatever mischief the English intriguers in Rome contrived to have effected by his masterly public expositions in the press of the true aims of the Irish National movement.

But that cause sustained a cruel blow when the moral collapse of the Irish leader was revealed in the London divorce court. Dr. Croke felt it, perhaps, more keenly than any of his fellow Bishops, inasmuch as he had been the first to take the Irish Protestant patriot by the hand and to commend him, thereby, to the confidence of the Catholic people. His grief over his fall was intense; his hopes for the regeneration of a country beloved not less than life shattered almost beyond possibility of revival. As the unhappy English King was said never to have smiled after the death of his son, so the great Archbishop never again shed the sunshine of his presence in any prominent public way upon the cause of Ireland. But in private he was still the same warm friend to the chiefs he had always trusted, nor did he despair of the ultimate success of the idea to which they still clung, in season and out. And the love of the Irish people for him continued in undiminished vigor. They understood his grief, and they respected the high motive which forbade his condoning an offense against a law which the Church holds as one of the most sacred of all her canons. If the people at large looked at the matter from a lesser point of view, there was not one to murmur at what this venerated spiritual guide thought it his duty to say or do. When the time of his jubilee came, a few years after Parnell's downfall and demise, they showed their unfaltering attachment to the Archbishop by one of the most impressive tributes that ever were offered. Irishmen from all parts of the world, indeed, joined in the effort to let all whom it might concern behold with what fidelity they still clung to the doctrine that the principles of Ireland's faith and Ireland's nationality are still so bound together that any cesura must be the death of both.

Dr. Croke's appearance in Ireland as Archbishop took place in August of 1875, when the whole population of the country seemed to have moved on the metropolis in honor of the centenary of Daniel O'Connell. There he saw a manifestation of Irish feeling for faith and fatherland, expressed in a thousand forms of artistic beauty, as the mighty all-day-long procession wound, to the unending strains of national melodies, through the streets and outward to Glasnevin, whither the Liberator's remains were to be transferred. If any one ever doubted of the intensity of Ireland's devotion, that vast dazzling blazon must have dispelled it forever. It could never be forgotten by those privileged to witness it. There was much that was similar in character between O'Connell and Croke, and the closing lines of Father Tom Burke's splendid panegyric on the occasion, are not inapplicable now to the great departed of Cashel:

"He is gone, but his fame shall live forever on the earth as a lover

of God and of his people. Adversaries, political and religious, he had many, and, like a

> tower of strength
> Which stood four square to all the winds that blew,

the Hercules of justice and of liberty stood up against them. 'His praise is in the Church,' and this is the surest pledge of the immortality of his glory."

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

NATIVE AMERICANISM.

LOOKING back, from the threshold of a new century, at the movements of Nativism and anti-Catholicism which transpired in the United States during the period 1835-60, we can feel little surprise in the premises. The mighty immigration of the nineteenth century jostled the settled colonists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, established here in a political and industrial ascendancy. A total of over five million immigrants landed on our shores up to 1850; a total of nearly twenty million up to 1900. At the close of the century over ten million foreign born persons are residents of the United States and more than twenty-six million[1] of the sixty-six million white inhabitants are of foreign parentage; making it quite certain that a majority of the Amreicans of to-day are descendants of forefathers who came here since Jefferson was President—the old Americans of Revolutionary lineage being outnumbered by the children of ancestors who were not here when Washington lived.

So mighty an invasion, peaceable though it was, could not transpire without much collision and many readjustments. The arrival in our large cities of thousands of immigrants, differing in race and religion from the native inhabitants, created conditions for social and political compromise. The Irish, for instance, while exhibiting a capacity to assimilate their neighbors, and sometimes (as in the case of the Norman and English settlers in Ireland) to make them "more Irish than the Irish themselves"—also have, for some reason or other, excited antagonisms more bitter than assailed any other race of immigrants.[2]

---

[1] By the census of 1900 more than half the people of foreign parentage in this country are of non-English speaking races. More than half, too, are in race neither Teutonic nor Anglo-Saxon.

[2] Scisco, in his "History of Political Nativism in New York," says (ch. I.):

In the sequel, Nativism met with utter defeat in all its cherished contentions; yet substantially the victory was on the side of the Americans of the older lineage. There was always a larger-viewed element among them disposed to welcome the immigrants to this country as "the asylum of the oppressed;" to see in the imported brawn of the Irish and German material for national enrichment—the industrial army needed for the development of the country. History, too, records no more notable instance of speedy and complete assimilation of a vast influx of population. The social, political and educational institutions of the Americans of Revolutionary lineage survived and absorbed and won over the mighty army of immigrants, and welded all elements into a unified nationality.

There never was any deep-seated antipathy to foreigners, as such, in this country. Nativism in its restricted sense (dislike of European immigrants on account of their birth) was always more or less accidental and sporadic. It is usual in discussing the genesis of the Native-American movement to refer to the Alien act of 1789 as one of the first manifestations of this feeling, or to the mythical order of Washington at Valley Forge: "Put none but Americans on guard to-night."

That which gave Native-Americanism its real strength and animus, however, was anti-Catholicism; and the roots of this feeling lie far back in colonial days. The colonists carried the "No Popery" sentiment from their English homes. Founded on sectarian lines, the colonies naturally were more deeply tinctured with this feeling than was England herself; and circumstances, such as warfare with the French Catholics on the north and west, and with the Spanish Catholics in Florida, deepened the sentiment. One reason that the French-Canadians did not join with the American colonies in revolt against England was their sense of being fairly treated by the English in their religious interests; and although the revolting colonies sent a Catholic priest among its emissaries to them with proffers of an equal partnership and independent statehood, they distrusted colonial bigotry. France's providential assistance to the struggling colonies, the presence of her Catholic soldiers with their affable chaplains and courteous officers, remained a liberalizing memory with the Revolutionary generation.

"An anonymous writer to the press touched on the truth when he complained of the Irish Catholics that 'they are men who, having professed to become Americans by accepting our terms of naturalization, do yet, in direct contradiction to their professions, clan together as a separate interest and retain their foreign appellation.' No better statement of Nativist complaint could have been made." Yet to a large extent this going apart of the Irish was but natural, in view of the contemptuous manner in which the "native" Americans treated them, ridiculing their appearance, their country and their religion.

From 1780 to 1830—a period of fifty years—the sentiment of bigotry slept with but little awakening. The brief crusade against aliens during the latter part of Adams' administration was strictly incidental to the division between the parties—the Jeffersonian party, as the friend of France, having the adhesion naturally of all the French, Irish and Scotch immigrants of that time. The Alien act which had extended the period of residence required for naturalization to fourteen years, was repealed in 1802, and the five years' requirement of residence restored. The demand made by the Hartford Convention (1814-15), that aliens be debarred from civil office may have been suggested by the enthusiasm with which the Irish immigrants hailed the war of 1812—so unpopular with New England. British Minister Foster, who had labored to prevent this war, said that among the Congressmen who voted to declare war were six members of the Society of United Irishmen.[3]

There was really little ground for alarm in the number of immigrants which reached our shores in the decades ending with 1840. Up to 1820 foreigners came to America at the rate of 10,000 a year. From 1821 to 1830, inclusive, 143,439 landed. From 1831 to 1840, the immigration increased to a total of nearly 600,000, or about three per cent. of the total population (seventeen millions) in 1840. From 1840-50 (principally in the last half of the decade) 1,700,000 immigrants arrived, or seven per cent. of the population in 1850. The percentage of the foreign born population in the decades prior to 1850 was considerably less than it has been since the close of the Civil War. In 1850 the foreign born element was 9.7 per cent. of the whole population. During the period 1860-1900 it has varied between 13 and 14 per cent.

The really alarming symptom was the large proportion of Catholics among the immigrants. More than a third of the immigrants for the decades ending 1830 and 1840 were from Ireland, and nearly one-half of the 1,700,000 who landed from 1841-50 were Irish. More than a half, and probably nearly three-fifths, of the immigrants up to 1860 were Catholics.

It is probable that the English "No Popery" agitation (1815-29), which antagonized the movement for Catholic emancipation in Ireland and England had some influence in alarming the more sectarian portion of the American public. The opposition to Catholic emancipation in England necessarily reverted to the position of Elizabeth's and Cromwell's time—that the Catholic religion was not entitled to toleration—that it was a political danger—that it inculcated a divided allegiance, etc. This argument was adopted in America. The pulpit

[3] See Alexander Johnston's article on "The American Party," in the "American Cyclopædia of Politics."

alarmist could point to new object lessons, up to this time unfamiliar to the American population: Bishops (there were only ten American Catholic Bishops in 1833), cathedrals (rather unpretentious affairs), sisterhoods in a peculiar garb and convents or nunneries.

The first outbreak occurred in 1834—the burning of the Ursuline convent at Charlestown, near Boston. In 1833 one Rebecca Reed had left this institution and told such tales of harsh treatment that when in the following year Miss Harrison (Sister Mary John) left the same convent in a dazed and hysterical condition, the public became excited. She suffered from nervous prostration, caused by overwork in preparing her pupils for an exhibition. Her brother induced her to return to the convent, where she was placed under a physician's care. On August 9, 1834, a mob composed of the lower element of Boston's population, surrounded the convent and, although Miss Harrison came forth and assured them that she was not detained against her will, they ransacked and burned the building. The better class of Boston citizens held an indignation meeting in Fanueil Hall, at which the Mayor presided, and the outrage was denounced. The perpetrators were put on trial, but weakly prosecuted and consequently acquittted. The Sisters never obtained compensation for their loss of property, although a committee of the Legislature recommended this act of public justice.

In 1836 a book was published which has been termed "The Uncle Tom's Cabin" of Know Nothingism.[4] Maria Monk, a girl of evil character, had been placed by her mother in a Magdalen asylum at Montreal under charge of a Catholic Sisterhood. Aided by a former paramour, she escaped and shortly fell into the company of one Rev. J. J. Slocum, who with others concocted a sensational and obscene narrative of her experience in the assumed capacity of a nun. This book was brought out with Howe & Bates as nominal publishers—these men being employes of Harper Brothers (which publishing firm really stood behind the enterprise, but was reluctant to assume direct responsibility). Maria Monk's "disclosures" had an immense sale, exceeding that of any American book up to that time published. Ministers recommended it and churches feted its author. She was taken into the bosom of Christian homes, where, after a time, her depravity was perceived. It is to be regretted that one so useful to evangelicalism should have been allowed to sink in the social scale so that she afterwards died in a public institution. The parties to this literary enterprise began squabbling among themselves for the profits. A party of Protestant clergymen visited

[4] There had been previous books of the same character appealing to erotic bigotry. We may mention "Rosamond; Her Life With the Priests." Born in Lebanon, N. H. A remarkable career. New York, 1836. 290 pp.

Montreal to verify the "awful disclosures" and pronounce them a fabrication. Colonel W. L. Stone, editor of the New York *Commercial Advertiser*, also made a thorough investigation, visiting the Hotel Dieu at Montreal from cellar to garret. "The result," he wrote, "is the most thorough conviction that Maria Monk is an arrant impostor, that she never was a nun," etc.

These two early eruptions of anti-Catholicism are particularly dwelt upon because they are the prototypes of its campaign tactics in the following years. Edward Wilson in 1845, Gavazzi and the "Angel Gabriel" in 1853-5, and a score of others followed in the line of Maria Monk, and what Professor John B. McMaster calls the "riotous career of the Know-Nothings," was a repetition of the convent burning of 1834. The ex-priest, the escaped nun and the incendiary led the way, as the logical exponents of a cause, which nevertheless numbered among its followers some respectable elements.

In the years following 1830 a new exuberance overtook the electoral life of the American people. They talked politics with vigor and gesticulation; they interrupted each other's political meetings; they jostled each other at the polls. It became part of the election day programme for each party to be represented at the voting precincts by partisans, loud of lungs and strong of arm. The native American had practised all the tricks and frauds of politics, such as intimidating voters, stuffing ballot boxes, repeating and tampering with the returns, long before the foreigner was instructed in these processes. In the history of the abolition movement we have an illustration of the riotous spirit of the American politics of that generation. In 1835 Thompson, an Abolition advocate, was mobbed in Boston and forced to leave the city. Garrison, too, felt the wrath of "a broadcloth mob." November 7, 1837, Lovejoy, an Abolitionist editor, was murdered at Alton, Ill., because he refused to suspend his publication. May 17, 1838, Pennsylvania Hall, the Abolitionist headquarters at Philadelphia, was burned to the ground by the intolerant opponents of the anti-slavery movement. And thus on to 1860 did Abolitionism meet with disorderly and riotous opposition. The party factions quarrelled with each other, Whigs assailed Whigs and Democrats assailed Democrats. The expression "Loco Focos" applied to one of the Democratic parties in New York arose over the incident of an interrupted meeting. Emissaries of one Democratic faction turned off the lights at a meeting held by another faction. Immediately the engloomed Democrats, who had prepared for the emergency beforehand, took from their pockets the new Loco Foco match which had just come into use, and relighted their meeting. The Know-Nothings ran their course at a time

when this sort of exuberant politics had reached its climax. The Know-Nothings were not the inventors, but they carried the method, especially in Baltimore, to its worst excesses.[5]

From a survey of disorder of this kind we are led to wonder where the American notion of free speech developed; yet it did evolve. If a mere glittering generality; if more honored in the breach than in the observance; if more as a pretence than a practice it was nevertheless finally fixed in the customs and principles of the people.

The first political flurry of Nativism in the local politics of New York seems to date from the year 1835. It is associated with the name of Samuel F. B. Morse, the inventor of the telegraph. Early in 1834 he published twelve letters in the New York *Observer* (a weekly paper), over the signature of "Brutus." These were afterwards republished under the title "Foreign Conspiracy Against the United States," a book much read up to 1860.

It appears that while in Europe during 1829-32, Morse had heard of the Leopold Foundation, an aid society established in Austria to help with financial assistance the missionary and poor Catholic churches of the New World. This was the most material fact in the dangers Morse discussed. The "Brutus Letters" had an important local influence. The Irish immigrants in the city were gathering antagonisms chiefly on account of their religion, and the "Brutus Letters" gave form to the argument. A Protestant association was founded to antagonize the Catholics, and it seems that on March 13, 1835, one of its meetings on Broadway was disturbed by Irish interruption, perhaps after the fashion common at that time of counter demonstrations at public meetings; but rather imprudent sport for foreigners.

In the fall election a Nativist committee put up Colonel Monroe (a nephew of ex-President Monroe) for Congress, and the Whigs endorsed him. But the Democrats, who cast three-fifths of the vote, elected their ticket. In the spring elections of 1836 the Nativists nominated Samuel F. B. Morse for Mayor, and he received about 1,500 votes out of a total of over 26,000 cast. A Democratic Mayor was elected. The Nativists tried a separate ticket again in the fall elections, with no better success; but in the spring of 1837 they put up Aaron Clark for Mayor, and at the same time drew up an address denouncing the Irish. The Whig party,[6] which had all along ex-

[5] Volunteer fire companies, which existed in the principal cities of the United States at this time, were largely responsible for street disorders. There was an intense rivalry between the companies, and sometimes fires were started on purpose to bring the rival firemen into collision.

[6] In New York city the Irish vote was cast largely with the Democratic party. Admiration for Andrew Jackson, the hero of New Orleans and a man of Irish

hibited a kindly interest in the Nativist doings, endorsed Clark, and he was elected by 3,300 plurality. The affair was treated as a Whig victory, and the Nativists disappeared as a separate political activity. Nativist sentiment continued, however, to exhibit itself in petitions to the State Legislature and to Congress, praying for a registry law and an extension of the period of residence required for naturalization to twenty-one years.

In other portions of the country the same sentiment manifested itself. A native American movement is said to have organized at Germantown, near Philadelphia, in 1837, growing out of an election episode. New Orleans felt the impulse also. The "Address of the Louisiana Native American Association," issued in 1839, contains this passage:

"So long as foreigners entered in moderate numbers into the States and Territories of the United States and became imperceptibly merged and incorporated into the great body of the American people, and were gradually imbued and indoctrinated into the principles of virtue and patriotism, which formerly animated the whole American community, so long their advent was an advantage and a benefit to our community. But when we see hordes and hecatombs (sic) of beings in human forms, but destitute of any intellectual aspirations—the outcast and offal of society, the pauper, the vagrant and the convict—transported in myriads to our shores, reeking with the accumulated crimes of the whole civilized and savage world, and inducted by our laws into equal rights, immunities and privileges with the noble native inhabitants of the United States, we can no longer contemplate it with supine indifference. We feel constrained to warn our countrymen that unless some steps are taken to protect our institutions from these accumulated inroads on the national character, from the indiscriminate immigration and naturalization of foreigners, in vain have our predecessors, whether native or naturalized, toiled and suffered and fought and bled and died to achieve our liberties and establish our hallowed institutions."

In 1841 a State convention was called in Louisiana to form an American Republican party. The convention favored the exclusion of foreigners from office. It exerted some influence in the succeeding municipal election in New Orleans.[7]

New York city, in 1840, had a population of 312,700, of whom not over a third were foreign born. The Catholic population of the city possessed eight churches and numbered perhaps 70,000. Philadelphia, in the same year, had a population of 258,000, of whom less than 60,000 were Catholics. (Bishop Kenrick, in 1840, placed the entire Catholic population of Pennsylvania, Delaware and Western New Jersey at 120,0000.) Boston, with a population in 1844 of about 120,000, had less than 30,000 Catholic residents. It seemed strange, in view of what has come to pass in later years, that the presence in these larger cities of a foreign population not exceeding

lineage, had drawn the vanguards of Irish immigration close in sympathy with the Democratic party. The politicians of that party did not fail to use every means to attach the adopted citizen to their organization.

[7] Congressmen Eustis, of Louisiana, in the House of Representatives, January 7, 1856, claimed that Louisiana was the first State whose Legislature called for an extension of the term of residence required for naturalization.

a fourth of the whole population, should have occasioned alarm in the minds of Americans during the '40's. Since these days the increased tide of immigration has foreignized, by actual majorities, counting all of foreign parentage, most of our large cities and even some of our Western States, without the slightest danger to our institutions or any similar alarm to our people.

Had the foreigners and Catholics remained quiescent, Nativism might have run its course as a milder disease. But this was not to be. The American atmosphere would not suffer any element long to demean itself as a subject class. The colonization of the nineteenth century challenged, in the name of religious equality, the Protestant ascendancy established by the colonists of the seventeenth century in the laws, and customs, and opinions of the several States. In Massachusetts, long after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, Congregationalism was virtually the religion of the State. In the Carolinas a Catholic could not hold office. Other States, like New Hampshire, had similar sectarian provision in their Constitutions and statutes.

Immigration endangered this ascendancy, and as soon as that fact was apparent the Protestant pulpit became aggressive. The particular issue in which this clash of forces came had reference to the schools. Under the New York school law of 1812, denominational schools received a pro rata share of the school fund raised by the State. But in New York city a private corporation called the Public School Society gradually absorbed all the public funds for that city. It claimed to be an unsectarian body, and declared that it excluded positive religious instruction from its schools. The Protestant Scriptures, however, were read, and in some cases commented upon. The Catholics presented a petition to the Common Council, and Bishop Hughes spoke in its behalf, praying that eight Catholic schools be granted a share of the school fund (October, 1840). The Catholics do not appear to have asked the exclusion of the Bible, but prejudice was stirred up on the representation that such was their demand.

The Common Council, which was Democratic, rejected the Bishop's petition after a full hearing, in which the Public School Society fought strenuously for its monopoly. The Catholics then carried their grievances to the State Legislature at Albany. William H. Seward was then Governor of New York. He had expressed himself in favor of the establishment of schools where the foreigners, now debarred from public education by religious prejudices, might be instructed by teachers of their own race and faith. For twenty years (1840-60) this idea of Seward's made him the target of the political anti-Catholics in New York State, and he reciprocated that

antagonism by holding the major element of the Whig party intact as a bulwark against the successive waves of Nativist and Know-Nothing assimilation.[8]

The Catholic appeal to the Legislature again stirred up a Nativist party, Samuel F. B. Morse once more occupying the leadership. All local parties having taken sides with the Public School Society in the nomination of candidates for the Legislature in 1841, Bishop Hughes decided to put up a Catholic ticket—the so-called "Carroll Hall" ticket. He did this against the vociferous objections of the entire local press, Democratic as well as Whig. The result of the election was as follows:

Whig ticket	15,980
Democratic ticket	15,690
Catholic ticket	2,200
Nativist ticket	470
Anti-Slavery ticket	120

It was said that Bishop Hughes (himself, if anything, a Whig) had sought to show the Democrats that the Catholics held the balance of power in New York city as between the Whig and Democratic parties. He succeeded in the demonstration, at least to the extent of defeating the Democratic ticket, which would otherwise have won. But it seems that only a half or a third of the Catholic voters supported the Carroll Hall ticket. In a Catholic population of 70,000 there were at that time probably from 5,000 to 7,000 Catholic voters in New York city.[9]

In the following year the Legislature at Albany, doubtless through the influence of Governor Seward, extended to New York city the provisions of the general act relating to common schools, thus obliterating the private Public School Society corporation and putting the State and the people in its place as the controlling power over the city schools. This was a victory, in principle, for Bishop Hughes, but it brought no funds to his parish schools. The Nativist elements of all parties combined for some years in electing a union school ticket.

The year 1843 saw a new and better organized spurt of Nativism in New York city. The episode that served to arouse it was the

[8] Colonel A. K. McClure, in his "Political Recollections," asserts that Seward's attitude on the school question lost him the nomination to the Presidency in 1860; that the leaders of the Republican party in Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana were favorable to Seward personally, but on account of his stand in the New York school controversy they could not hope to attract to his candidacy the anti-slavery Know-Nothing vote in those States, which were regarded at the time as doubtful States.

[9] This is the only instance in American politics of a Catholic ticket at the polls. It seemed necessary at the time to clear the political atmosphere. Of course it did not lack provocation either in the existence of a menacing anti-Catholic movement.

favor shown by the Democratic party to the Irish, in return for Irish support in the April elections. Not only were petty offices liberally bestowed, but market licenses were given to foreign born tradesmen. Heretofore these had been (as in the case of school control) a species of Nativist monopoly.

The American Republican party was formed,[10] and it came into the fall elections with a statement of principles, among which was the following:

"That through this school law (the legislative enactment of April, 1842) there has been a preconcerted determination, followed up by an actual attempt in the Fourth Ward, to put out of our schools the Protestant Bible, and to put down the whole Protestant religion (therein) as being sectarian." *(Journal of Commerce,* November 4, 1843.)

The platform further demanded that foreign-born persons should not be naturalized until they had resided here twenty-one years. The Nativist party polled 8,690 votes in the November election, out of a total of 37,000. Its strength appears to have been drawn quite equally from both parties. Hammond, in his "Political History of New York," avers that "the wealth, talent and respectability of the community" went into its ranks. In the ensuing election (April, 1844) the Nativist party selected James Harper, of the firm of Harper Brothers, publishers, as its candidate for Mayor. Both Democrats and Whigs made their customary nominations; but there was a tacit understanding among the Whigs that their support should be thrown largely to Harper (who had been a Whig). Harper was elected. The vote stood: Harper, 24,510; Coddington (Dem.), 20,538; Franklin (Whig), 5,297. The *Journal of Commerce* (April 12, 1844) figured that the native American vote was made up of 14,100 Whigs, 9,700 Democrats and 601 new voters.

Harper's election was the occasion for a revival of the former alliance between the Whigs and the Nativists. In the fall election of

[10] The following appears among the declarations of the Nativist meeting held in New York, June 10, 1843:

RESOLVED, That we as Americans will never consent to allow the government established by our Revolutionary forefathers to pass into the hands of foreigners, and that while we open the door to the oppressed of every nation and offer a home and an asylum, we reserve to ourselves the right of administering the government in conformity with the principles laid down by those who have committed to our care.

From this time on we hear much about the degeneracy of American local politics, due, so it is alleged, to the influence of the foreign-born voters. There has always been a strong suspicion that this opinion was merely the result of Nativist prejudice. Bryce (Volume II. of his "American Commonwealths," page 241), says: "Nevertheless the immigrants are not so largely responsible for the faults of American politics as a stranger might be lead, by the language of many Americans, to suppose. There is a disposition in the United States to use them, and especially the Irish, much as the cat is used in the kitchen, to account for broken plates and food which disappears. The cities have, no doubt, suffered from the immigrants—but New York was not an Eden before the Irish came."

1844 (which was also a Presidential election) the Whigs threw their strength solidly to the Nativists' local legislative ticket, but the Nativists did not fully reciprocate. The Nativist legislative ticket was elected, 27,440 to 26,230 (Dem.), but Polk, the Democratic candidate for President, carried New York city by several thousand plurality over Clay. Seward had openly disapproved of the Whig alliance with the Nativists, and this experience strengthened the position he had taken. The Whigs proceeded to drop the Nativists. At the city election in April, 1845, Harper was defeated and a Democratic Mayor elected, the poll showing 24,210 Democratic votes, 17,480 Nativist and 7,030 Whig. The Nativists were almost completely wiped off the official roster, electing but one of their candidates, a constable. They continued to put up local tickets up to April, 1847, but their vote diminished from 8,370 in November, 1845, to 2,080 in April, 1847. They put up a State ticket in 1846, which received an aggregate of 6,170 votes.

Bishop Hughes, in an editorial published February 3, 1844, in a weekly paper regarded as the organ of the diocese, had alluded to the new party as a movement in "local politics." "Many will probably join this party who are really friends of foreigners," he said, "but who, for the moment, will coalesce with their enemies to accomplish some local purpose, of which foreigners form no part. The true issue is for the loaves and fishes of office, and as but a small share of these, if any, falls to the lot of foreigners, so, notwithstanding the abuse of their name, they may consider themselves as scarcely interested in the quarrel. The true issue is between natives and natives; there let it remain."

While most of the foreign-born vote was Democratic, the Whigs were not without a share of it. Bishop Hughes, for instance, tells us that his first vote was cast for Henry Clay. In the campaign of 1840 the Democratic leaders in New York corralled almost the solid naturalized vote by representing that Harrison was opposed to the "adopted citizen." This provoked Whig resentment. "Do we not hear of the organization of a party against the Catholics?" wrote Seward to a friend in 1840.

The school question was also one of the mainsprings of the Nativist movement in Philadelphia. In this connection it may be remarked that in the many subsequent clashes with Protestant ascendancy, of which the New York and Philadelphia instances were among the earliest, the Catholic contention was, ultimately, almost everywhere successful, because it was grounded on the logic of religious equality.

If the Maine supreme court in 1854 (Donohue vs. Richards) decided that Catholic pupils in the public schools might be compelled

to read the King James Bible, the victory of sectarianism was only temporary; the decision of the Wisconsin supreme court in 1890 (Edgerton Bible case) brought to a climax a series of educational rulings, both in law and practice, which have quite generally excluded the Bible from the public schools and more or less eliminated the offensive tone to Catholics of many of the text books, against which there was mild protests in 1840. In November, 1842, Bishop Kenrick of Philadelphia, while not asking that the Bible be excluded from the public schools of that city, petitioned the School Board that Catholic children be allowed the liberty of using the Catholic version where Bible reading was prescribed.

In January, 1843, the Philadelphia School Board voted that no children whose parents objected to Bible reading be obliged to be present at Bible exercises. Out of this matter a controversy ensued, and Bishop Kenrick, on March 12, 1844, issued a statement that "Catholics have not asked that the Bible be excluded from the public schools."

The Philadelphia riots of May, 1844, are connected with this episode, at least in the opinion of the prejudiced grand jury called to investigate the affair. The grand jury attributed the riots to "the efforts of a portion of the community to exclude the Bible from the public schools." The Catholics denied this and claimed the jury was packed. But the charge, even as it stands, would not in our day seem to justify or provoke rioting or incendiarism. These riots undoubtedly gave Nativism a set back throughout the country. The popular verdict blamed the anti-Catholic party. The disorder arose over some collision in the streets as a Native American meeting was dispersing before a rain storm. The riots which followed lasted for three days. Though the Mayor was knocked down in one of the encounters, it is probably true, as the Catholics alleged, that there was half-heartedness, if not actual collusion, in the way the authorities met the disorder. The mob moved upon the Irish quarter in Kensington and burned twenty-nine houses. Next day two Catholic churches, St. Michael's and St. Augustine's, were destroyed and a convent set ablaze. A number of lives were lost. Bishop Kenrick issued a card suspending "the exercise of public worship in the Catholic churches which still remained until it can be resumed with safety and we can enjoy our constitutional rights to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience."

This was, at least, furnishing subject of meditation for the thoughtful.[11] In New York Bishop Hughes, admonished by these events,

[11] Scisco, "Political Nativism in New York," page 47, says: "The Philadelphia riots nevertheless lost much sympathy to the cause of Nativism, and their occurrence was deeply regretted."

took legal advice as to whether compensation could be obtained for property destroyed by rioters. Being advised in the negative, he said: "Then the law intends that citizens should defend their own property." He issued an extra edition of the *Freeman's Journal*, calling on Catholics to defend their churches with their lives. The Native Americans, who had called a public meeting, revoked their call in view of this action. Bishop O'Gorman ("History Catholic Church," p. 375) tells us that a large Irish society in New York, with divisions in every district, resolved that, in case a single Catholic church were destroyed, to fire buildings in all quarters and involve the city in a great conflagration. Boston had a Nativist Mayor, Thomas Aspinwall Davis, in 1845 as a result of a triangular contest. In the following year the control of the city reverted to the Whigs.

Though the field of its action was mostly confined to local politics, the Native American movement had some results in the broader field (1830-40). Some of the Whig leaders, like Clay, Scott and Filmore, undoubtedly sympathized with the principles of the Native American party. In 1844 Clay wrote to a friend: "There is a general tendency among the Whigs to unfurl the banner of the Native American party" ("Von Holst" II., 524. Scott in the *National Intelligencer* (December, 1844), advocated the practical exclusion of all foreign-born persons from the suffrage. Later he claimed that the Mexican war had removed the cataract from his eyes. ("Von Holst," IV., 158).

New York was a pivotal State in the Presidential election held in November, 1844. Polk polled just 5,106 more votes in New York than Clay, and this gave him New York's thirty-six electoral votes, and the Presidency. Millard Fillmore, in a letter to Clay, attributed the loss of New York to Catholic defection from the Whigs, occasioned by the affiliation of Native Americanism with that party. Anti-Masonry had deprived Clay of the Presidential nomination in 1840, and between Native Americanism and the Liberal party he lost the election in 1844. But the resentment of the naturalized voters was not all due, properly, to the Whigs. The aid of a fair percentage of the Democratic party always went to the proscriptive ticket. In the fall election of 1844 this Democratic contingent, while voting generally for the Polk electors, in Philadelphia and New York enabled the Native Americans to elect their local tickets.

In April, 1845, the Nativist movement claimed 48,000 members in New York State (of whom 18,000 were in New York city), 42,000 in Pennsylvania, 14,000 in Massachusetts and 6,000 scattered in other States. (*Rochester American*, April 26, 1845). A convention of the native Americans convened at Philadelphia July 4, 1845, with

141 delegates present, representing fourteen States. It adopted a national platform and an address to the people. A second national convention met May 4, 1847, at Pittsburg, with eleven States represented. At its second session at Philadelphia, September 10, 1847, it recommended Zachary Taylor for President.

Six native American Congressmen (four from New York and two from Pennsylvania) were elected to the Twenty-ninth Congress. But one native American Congressman appeared in the Thirtieth Congress and none in the Thirty-first.

The Mexican war had come and gone (1846-8). A great event had set new currents afloat. Native Americanism began to disappear.[12] Both parties were again courting the naturalized citizen whom the Irish famine was sending to our shores in vaster numbers. Candidates were found purging themselves from the suspicion of affiliation with Nativism. Even Scott, the Whig candidate for President in 1852, said *peccavi.* In the lull which followed the prostration of the Whigs a new form of the old movement was, however, starting into vigorous growth. This was Know-Nothingism.

H. J. Desmond.

Milwaukee, Wis.

SPANISH FRIARS IN CALIFORNIA.

THE settlement of Upper California was the last colonial expansion of Spanish rule in America. It was begun in 1769, the birth year of Napoleon when already the forebodings of the American Revolution were being heard in the colonies of England. Its motives and its methods were typically Spanish. They were almost identical with those of the settlement of the Philippines by Legaspi two hundred years earlier. Each was carried out directly under supervision of the Central Government and on the principles of public morality and policy recognized by the rulers of Spain. In this both California and the Philippines had a distinctive character of their own unlike that of most settlements in Spanish America. Mexico, Peru and Chile were each conquered by bands of private adventurers, who at the most received licenses

[12] Scisco, in his "Political Nativism in New York," page 252, says: "The Nativist political movement in national and State affairs was a sham and a pretext. The nation as a whole was never Nativist in feeling. Probably no one State, as a whole, was ever genuinely worried over the existence of the foreign element. In State and national campaigns Nativism was a politician's movement rather than a popular one."

to occupy new lands from the government, and who were practically independent of its wishes in the organization of the territories occupied. It is but reasonable to form our judgment of the real principles of Spanish colonial policy by their application in those cases where the government had the power as well as the will to apply them in practice.

The occupation of new lands as a field for European colonization or a source of revenue was not the motive which inspired the settlement of California. It was entirely too remote from the civilized world at the time and Spain's other colonies offered ample occupation for her population on more favorable conditions. The political interest of Spain in California was only to prevent its occupation by some other European power as Russia or England. As there was no threat of war a couple of small garrisons would suffice to secure Spanish occupation, and the material interests involved went no further. The conversion of the savages to Christian belief was, however, always regarded as a desirable object for its own sake by the public sentiment of the Spanish people and its rulers. It was provided for in California with as much care and detail as the military and naval details of the occupation. The earnestness with which Spanish public men sought such an end as the conversion of savages may seem fanaticism to modern non-Catholics, but there is no reason to doubt its existence and still less to attribute it to greed, ambition or hypocrisy.

The preparations for the colony were begun in 1766, when Jose Galvez was sent to Mexico as Visitor General to investigate the condition of the Viceregal government. His powers were superior to the Viceroys, and the details of the proposed colony were left entirely in his hands. His methods and personal activity show little grounds for unfavorable criticism and certainly are widely different from the popular ideas of Spanish colonial administration. Spain at the time had no naval force on the western coast of Mexico. Galvez began by building a dockyard at San Blas, where vessels might be built and repaired for a regular service to California. Three "packets" of about two hundred tons each were considered sufficient for this purpose and they were finished after considerable difficulty in obtaining materials and skilled mechanics in the remote settlement. It is an indication of the attention to details of the Spanish official that he introduced the culture of hemp to the country near San Blas to provide cordage for the new shipping there.

Two garrisons were to be established permanently in Upper California with a force of about a single company. The soldiers and a few mechanics and laborers were the only colonists Galvez proposed to send. If settlers desired to come from Mexico they would be

encouraged, but Galvez saw little reason to expect many. The soldiers were allowed to marry and bring their wives and families if they so desired. Their pay was fixed at the liberal rate for the time of twenty-five dollars a month each. For the conversion and civilization of the natives the Franciscan friars were selected as agents. The Visitor applied to the missionary college of San Fernando in the Mexican capital to supply whatever number of priests might be needed. He engaged that they should receive full control of any converts they might be able to win over without any interference from the military authorities, and he further provided cattle and other farming requisites for establishing agricultural settlements among the natives. Each missionary was also allowed a salary of three hundred dollars, but this was drawn not from the treasury, but from the Pious Fund. The latter consisted of some landed property which had been given by private charity for the support of the Jesuit missions, and which was now administered for that end by government.

Monterey and San Diego were chosen as sites. These ports had been known to Spanish navigators for a hundred and fifty years and their latitudes marked on the pilot books, but neither had been visited since the time of Philip II. There was some uncertainty whether they could be reached from Mexico owing to the prevalent winds, though the galleons from the Philippines were accustomed to sail down the coast from Cape Mendocino and were familiar with its chief landmarks. For this reason Senor Galvez sent two vessels by different courses, one keeping near the shore and the larger holding a course in the outer ocean. The event justified his precautions. The last to leave Cape San Lucas reached San Diego in forty-six days, while the San Antonio spent a hundred and ten on her trip and arrived with a crew decimated by scurvy. There were not enough healthy men left even to put out a boat when the anchor was dropped in San Diego.

The land expeditions crossed the two hundred miles between the most northerly mission of the peninsula and San Diego without any opposition. Each was made up of twenty-five or thirty soldiers with a few mule drivers and some Christian Indians from the peninsular missions. The soldiers were drawn from two branches of the Spanish military service—regulars of the Catalan dragoons and frontier militia of the corps known as "leather jackets," from the cuirasses of that material which they wore in Indian campaigns. The militia division under Captain Rivera was the first to reach San Diego after six weeks' journey across the desert. Both vessels were there before them, and the sick from the San Carlos had been landed and placed under tents. Captain Portola, the commander of the

whole expedition, got in six weeks later, and during that time nine sailors had died and the epidemic had spread to the soldiers and the crew of the other ship. There were not enough sailors left to work even one vessel up to Monterey, which was the second place Portola had orders to find and occupy. Twenty-nine more died in two weeks after his arrival, and the plague showed no sign of abating. Half the soldiers who came by sea were among the deaths. The outlook was a dismal one at fifty days' journey from any settlement. Portola carried out his orders, however, with military devotion to duty as best he could. Twelve of the sailors were still in a degree fit for duty, and with them Captain Perez in the San Antonio undertook to run to San Blas. It was a veritable race against death, as nine men died during the twenty days of the voyage and the survivors were so weak that they could not even drop anchor until succored from the shore. Vila, the senior captain, remained with five men and two boys on the San Carlos in the infected port. Portola had but forty soldiers left. He determined at all risks to make the long march of five hundred miles through the unexplored land to Monterey. Eight soldiers were left as a guard for the sick, and Portola with the rest and some muleteers and Indians set out on their march on the 14th of July, 1769.

They reached Monterey on the 1st of October, but in the absence of any seaman among the party none of them could recognize the wide roadstead as a port. They pushed northwards for another month until further progress was barred by the Golden Gate of San Francisco, then first seen by white men. The Governor had to turn back with his mission unaccomplished, though with a discovery of far more importance than Monterey. He reached San Diego in the end of January only to find that half of those he had left there had perished in the epidemic.

The Indian population had been friendly all through Portola's expedition. They brought fish and seeds to the Spaniards, conversed with them by signs and got beads and trinkets in return. The record of this Spanish military exploration, like that of Legaspi in the Philippines, was wholly bloodless. Its contrast in that respect with English or Dutch colonial history is marked. At San Diego there was a skirmish in the meanwhile. Some natives tried to rob the sick Spaniards and kill their guards. They came in a large body, killed a Mexican and wounded two others, but were driven off by the four soldiers on duty with the loss of two or three killed. A few days later the hostiles came to offer peace and even brought their wounded for treatment by the Spanish surgeon and the friars, which was cheerfully given. No attempt at reprisals was made by the Spaniards either at the time or after the return of Portola's force.

No tidings had been received from Mexico in the meantime, though it was six months since the packet had sailed for San Blas. Provisions were running out, and Portola decided to abandon San Diego if no vessel arrived by the 20th of March. By a providential concurrence of orders and mishaps the San Antonio appeared off the harbor on the 19th and then disappeared to enter it again three days later. She had been ordered to sail directly to Monterey, while a companion vessel was sent to San Diego. The latter was lost at sea and the San Antonio after reaching the Santa Barbara Channel had to put back in consequence of the loss of an anchor there. Her opportune arrival alone prevented the abandonment of California after all the efforts of the Spanish authorities to occupy its distant territory.

Portola journeyed again to Monterey, and this time had no difficulty in recognizing its anchorage. The sea breezes were blowing from the north and made the form of the harbor visible even to a landsman by the pondlike surface of the water sheltered by the promontory of Ano Nuevo. The San Antonio, too, arrived at Monterey, and the post was formally established just a year after Portola's arrival at San Diego. A stockade and cabins for the garrison were built, and California became for the first time a recognized province of Mexico. Portola, in obedience to orders, sailed to San Blas and never returned. A lieutenant of dragoons and about fifty soldiers remained to maintain Spanish authority in California.

Such were the methods used in the latest colonial enterprise of Spain, and it cannot be denied that they show small warrant for the current legends of Spanish cruelty or tyranny. During five years there is only record of a single affray between the soldiers thus left alone in the wilderness and the savages around them. At San Diego six years after the first settlement several hundred natives attacked and burned the mission which lay some miles from the soldiers' stockade. One of the priests and two workmen were killed on this occasion and the surviving friar with three soldiers had to stand a seige during a whole night with no better shelter than the mud walls of a kitchen, the roof of which was burned over their heads. A company of soldiers from Arizona arrived shortly afterwards, but at the urgent request of the Franciscan superior no punitive measures were adopted beyond flogging some of the leaders in the attack. The policy of forgiveness, it may be added, was formally enjoined by Bucareti, the Viceroy of Mexico.

When one compares this with the usual conduct of Europeans among savage races, with Grenville in early Virginia or Mason in Connecticut, it is hard to see on what grounds a writer like Lecky makes the assertion that "blind folly, ignoble selfishness, crushing

tyranny and hideous cruelty mark every page of Spain's colonial history." This remarkable judgment, by the way, forms the heading of Mr. Bigelow's chapter on Spanish colonization in a recent work.

It is in the Spanish friars, however, rather than in the Spanish soldiers or government that the interest of Californian history centres. There was no need for military exploits beyond the ordinary performance of soldiers' duty during the whole existence of California as a colony of Spain. There were few colonists and no special legislation during the fifty years which followed the discovery of San Francisco Bay and the settlement of Monterey. The chief work of settlement was the collection of the Indians into agricultural communities around the churches built by the Franciscan friars. In 1772 Father Serra gathered twelve priests in Monterey, while its garrison was scarcely twenty-five soldiers. Spanish friars all through were nearly half as numerous in California as Spanish soldiers, and the total of both scarcely equaled the American garrison of Guam at the present time. It was far less than the English detachments which exterminated the Tasmanians in about the same time at the other side of the world.

Five Franciscans accompanied the first settlement in 1769. Ten more were sent from San Blas in 1772, and seven came with Father Palou from the Lower Californian missions the next year. The president of all was Junipero Serra, who came with Portola by land to San Diego. The others of the first band were Fathers Crespi, Parron, Gomez and Viscaino. Fathers Serra and Crespi, with several of the other Californian missionaries, were natives of Mallorca, in the Mediterranean. They had entered the order in boyhood, and both had been sent to follow the courses of philosophy and theology in the University of Palma, the capital of that island. Serra had passed several years after his ordination in the usual work of a Franciscan in the country districts. He had been professor of philosophy in the university and distinguished as a zealous preacher before he volunteered for the task of missionary among the savage tribes of New Spain, at the age of 36. He had been employed among the savages of the Sierra Gorda in Mexico for over sixteen years before his mission to California, where he passed fifteen as president. Father Serra had the advantage of a biographer in his colleague Palou, whose friendshi pbegan in boyhood and continued all through his varied life in Mallorca, Mexico and California. Palou's life of his friend was published in Mexico in 1787, and thus gives a contemporary picture of the work of Spanish friars in California. Their motives and methods, their objects in life for themselves and others were different from those of modern Americans, but they were as far apart as heaven from earth from the pictures

of them so freely offered to-day in English and American literature.

Serra's first part in the California expedition was the arrangement with the Visitor Galvez of the location and naming of the first missions. The first point had necessarily to be determined by the position of the Spanish posts, but on the second there was a difference of opinion between the official and the friar. San Diego had already received the name of a national saint, Diego de Alcala, and its mission should also bear his name. That of Monterey was given to the namesake of the King, St. Charles of Milan, and the third was by Galvez assigned to the Franciscan, St. Bonaventura. Father Serra urged the claim of St. Francis himself to a local habitation in the land which his spiritual children were to convert. Galvez was not disposed to change, and jokingly remarked: "If St. Francis care for a mission let him show us a port for its location." Serra accepted the remark seriously. As a matter of fact there was already a port near Point Reyes marked by the name of San Francisco on the Spanish charts, but it was beyond the limit of occupation planned by Galvez. On Portola's expedition to Monterey, however, his party went north in the belief that Monterey itself really was north of the latitude usually given it. The error was only recognized when the unmistakable Point Reyes came in sight of the travelers. It was impossible to reach it owing to the great bay without a name which lay south of the old haven. The enthusiasm of Serra transferred the name of the Franciscan founder to the new discovery, nor did he rest till a mission and garrison were formed on its shore under the venerated name of Francis d'Assisi, the first of the "degraded" friars.

Another characteristic incident marked his journey to San Diego in company of Portola. Serra was 56 years of age and had suffered for many years from an ulcer on one leg. He had contracted it on his first arrival in Mexico, when he and a companion as true Franciscans journeyed on foot, and with only sandals to cover their feet, up the steep road from Vera Cruz to the capital. Before setting out for San Diego he felt it his duty to visit all the missions of Lower California which had been placed under his charge and which he now was leaving to his friend Palou. This trip of several hundred miles brought on an inflammation, and a day after entering the desert beyond the last mission he was unable to mount his mule. The Governor urged him to return to the mission and offered to have him carried there in a litter, but Serra positively refused. He would go on to San Diego at any cost of pain, and as a friar he would not let men be made as beasts of burthen for him. There was no physician at hand, so the Franciscan called the help of one of the mule drivers and asked him to treat the inflamed leg as he would the chafed back

of a mule. The muleteer tried a poultice of herbs and tallow, and the next day Serra, though suffering much pain, was able to mount and go on. At the end of the forty-six days' journey he wrote joyfully to Father Palou that the afflicted leg was bettter than the other, though he still retained a lameness which lasted till death.

At San Diego the sufferers from the epidemic occupied his attentions for the first six months. Fathers Crespi and Gomez were sent with the party in search of Monterey, while the other three friars remained with the sick at San Diego. Serra formally founded its mission the day after Portola's departure, amid all the ravages of the plague. It was only a name and a large cross, with two or three huts of branches to shelter the friars at night and say Mass in in the mornings. When the natives attacked the strangers a few days later Father Viscaino was wounded by an arrow, and all three priests subsequently caught the epidemic from their patients. They recovered, but food was scarce and none of the settlers was fit to work, so the mission buildings had to be postponed till the return of Portola.

The Governor's return was a fresh disappointment. Portola felt that San Diego must be abandoned unless help came, and he declined to let his men put up any buildings. The Indians showed no inclination to conversion during all this time. Once Father Serra asked to baptize a dying infant, but when he was beginning the ceremony an Indian snatched the child and ran off. Palou tells how the grief of this loss to the little savage remained keen with the old priest to the close of his life. Possibly such feelings indicate the "hideous selfishness" so strongly urged by Mr. Lecky as a prominent trait in Spanish character.

The most that Serra and his two companions could do for the conversion of the heathens was to make friends with a solitary boy. He came regularly to visit them and learned a little Spanish, but the feasts of his rancheria were always enough to carry him away. The friars labored hard to learn the dialects of their future flock, but with little result at first. Food, too, was running scarce, and Father Serra declared a tortilla a day with the Indian seeds was quite enough for his own needs. Under all these difficulties he determined not to abandon San Diego even if the garrison was withdrawn. He conferred with Captain Vila on the subject, and the sea captain also decided to remain with his vessel while an ounce of food was left. The appearance of the San Antonio on St. Joseph's day prevented the endurance of the friars being put to the test of solitary residence among the greedy savages of San Diego.

When Portola started again for Monterey Father Serra went there in the packet and Crespi again made the long land journey. The

wounded Father Viscaino had been sent back to Lower California. Fathers Gomez and Parou stayed with the corporal's guard of eight men which formed the garrison of the San Diego stockade and tried to win the good will of the fickle natives. The identity of the port of Monterey having been satisfactorily established, Portola took formal possession of California for Spain by raising the royal standard and the "usual pulling of grass, piling up stones and taking note of the same," as Crespi's diary quaintly puts it. Before the official ceremony Father Serra sang High Mass under the same old oak where Mass had been said a hundred and sixty-eight years before by Viscaino's chaplains. After its conclusion Father Serra as chief of the mission also formally founded the mission of San Carlos by the spiritual powers vested in him by the Holy See and the College of San Fernando. The distinctive functions of Church and State, though working together, were clearly defined by the Spanish friars. The mission's beginning was a very modest one. A palisade was built and a few huts run up within it to serve as church and residences, the soldiers and sailors helping in the works with four Californian Indians from the Peninsula. None of the natives appeared at either mission foundation for some days, but then they commenced to call on the strangers. Fathers Serra and Crespi made it their first care to study the dialects of the district and then gradually brought the main doctrines of the Catholic faith to their notice. The Monterey Indians made no objection to the new teachings, but it was a considerable time before the friars considered their intelligence of them such as to warrant their admission to baptism. The first baptism was administered in December, six months after the foundation of the mission. To make intercourse more free and also to get better land for cultivation, the mission settlement was removed about six miles from the presidio the next year. Five soldiers, four Christian Indians and the two priests were its first population. The Indians came in more freely and the friars began the cultivation of patches of wheat and corn, in which, too, the savages were invited to take part. The supplies for the first three years were chiefly drawn from the packets, which brought corn, flour and dried beef from San Blas for the friars and their help, as well as for the soldiers. With the increase of tillage and the small number of cattle which had been brought from Lower California the friars at the end of that time were self-supporting and had provisions to distribute to the natives. Some of the latter came regularly to instructions and were baptized, but only a part of these converts came to dwell in the mission settlement. Others still gathered nuts and seeds in the woods for their food while coming to Mass and teaching. By the close of 1773 a census made by Father Palou for the Mexican authorities

gave an account of the five missions then established. In that of Monterey a hundred and seventy-five converts had been baptized, and others were coming from their rancherias for instructions. Twenty-eight marriages of Indians and three between Spanish soldiers and Indian women had been blessed in the first three years, while eleven dead had got Christian burial. The harvest had failed the year before and only five fanegas of wheat were saved for seed. The mission establishment had forty-seven head of cattle, twenty-eight hogs, nine horses and twelve mules. It also had a carpenter shop and six plows, with other tools. Such were the beginnings of a Franciscan mission.

San Diego had even harder experience than Monterey. Fathers Gomez and Parron both broke down in health and had to be sent to Lower California to recover before Monterey was founded. Two new arrivals, Dumetez and Jayme, succeeded them, but Father Dumetez also had to be sent away, though he returned later and passed nearly forty years on the missions of Upper California. Father Fuster took his place, and the friars at last seemed acclimated in San Diego. The natives, however, still continued indifferent or unfriendly, and the crop of the first year was washed out by a flood, and that of the next season failed for want of rains. The country around the port was explored for a fertile tract for four or five years, and finally in 1774 the Indian mission was moved five or six miles away from the fort and buildings erected in the new site. Though there were eleven or twelve rancherias of natives within a radius of twenty miles, very few converts—only ninety-seven—were won in six years of dreary toil. The establishment of the mission in the new site brought an improvement, and in 1775 Fathers Jayme and Fuster enrolled sixty converts, though their first harvest of grain was a failure. The hostility of the heathen savages was aroused, and in November a band of several hundred attacked the mission by night. Its inmates beside the two friars and the Indian converts who lived in their huts near by were only seven or eight white men. Four soldiers and three mechanics with an invalid boy formed the number. The savages crept into the palisade in the darkness, having first put guards over the huts of the Christian Indians. They set fire to the church, which, like the other buildings, was only of rough timbers thatched with reeds, and in a moment its roof was in a blaze. Father Jayme rose hurriedly and came out to call help. He was pierced with a cloud of arrows, knocked down and beaten brutally till life was extinct. The mission smith was also killed and another man badly wounded. The survivors took refuge in the kitchen, which had adobe walls a few feet high on three sides, and in this they defended themselves stoutly all the night. Two of the

soldiers were disabled by arrows and the roof was burned over the heads of the occupants, but the three soldiers continued to load and fire, and the savages shrank from coming to close quarters despite their numbers. A sack of fifty pounds of powder was stored in the kitchen, and while the roof was burning Father Fuster, who as a priest would take no part in slaying men, even in self-defense, seated himself on the powder and covered it with his habit against the falling sparks and brands. The corporal was the best shot of the party, and the other two loaded the flint-lock muskets and handed them to him for use. He killed or wounded so many of the assailants that at daybreak the savages retired. Four soldiers came up from the fort near the port, which had also been attacked and successfully defended by the ten men who formed its garrison. Search was made for the bodies, and that of Father Jayme was found at some distance stripped and pounded out of all resemblance to human features. It was carried to the fort and buried there with due religious ceremonies as well as the other victim. The carpenter of the fort, who had been mortally wounded, died a few days later. The whole of the mission buildings were destroyed as well as the provisions and church furniture.

The action taken towards the treacherous natives after this destruction was somewhat uncommon. The twelve soldiers in San Diego could take no punitive measures beyond threatening the hostiles, but within a couple of months Captain Rivera came down from Monterey with twenty men and Captain Aroza, who was leading a colony from Arizona, also brought a similar force of frontier soldiers. The two Spanish officers visited all the lately hostile rancherias, who were now thoroughly scared, and arrested most of the leaders. Father Serra, as head of the Franciscans, interceded with Rivera that no death punishment should be inflicted for the murder of Jayme, and he wrote to the Viceroy Bucareli to the same effect. His own sentiments were expressed characteristically when the news of Jayme's death reached Monterey. "Thanks to God, the land is irrigated, and now the conversion of the San Dieguinos will come." Rivera yielded so far as to confine the punishment inflicted on the culprits to flogging and imprisonment until the Viceroy's letters should come to hand. Bucareli's answer arrived in June. It ran thus on Serra's request: "In view of the wise and Christian suggestions in the letter of your Reverence that it is better to win the rebels by kindness than to cow them by punishment, I have ordered Captain Rivera so to act. It may, too, be the best policy for winning over the other tribes, and I have ordered the officials to rebuild the ruined mission and found another." The murderers were all released on Michaelmas day except one who had

hanged himself while in confinement. Palou notes that this individual had attempted Serra's life just six years before.

Two other incidents are worth notice. The carpenter who was mortally wounded in the night attack bequeathed by will his accumulated wages to the benefit of the mission to the Indians from whom he had received his death. Later when Captain Rivera was arresting the hostiles a renegade Christian who had joined in the attack was denounced by his own people. He took sanctuary in the Presidio Chapel and Father Fuster maintained the rights guaranteed by the canon and Spanish laws to suspected criminals of exemption from arrest while within church walls. The fact that Carlos, the Indian in question, had been one of the murderers of his own colleague did not affect Father Fuster's determination. Rivera disregarded it and took Carlos by force out of the church. The friar thereon placed the Governor under interdict of attending Mass or receiving the sacraments until he should return the prisoner to sanctuary. He wrote his reasons to Serra as his superior and sent them by Rivera himself. Father Serra on examination approved of his subordinate's course. Rivera was much irritated and showed it by his refusal to allow the mission to be restored, an object specially desired by Serra. Neither the Governor's irritation nor its effects on his own interests could move the Franciscan to recede from the line of duty to the law of the Church. The incident throws strong light on the character which has generally marked the Spanish friars in America of strict devotion to law for themselves and indulgence for the defects of native character. The mission was finally rebuilt, after more than a year's delay, in obedience to the Viceroy's orders. Within the next six years Father Serra's anticipations were fairly realized, and over seven hundred Indians were enrolled as converts in San Diego.

San Diego and Monterey as ports and military posts might be regarded in a degree as European settlements. Most of the twenty Franciscan missions were pure Indian villages apart from European intercourse. There were usually two friars in each, with three or more soldiers as a police force and occasionally Spanish or Mexican mechanics as instructors or workmen. San Antonio and San Gabriel, the first founded, will show the ordinary mission better than Monterey or San Diego.

About a year after the occupation of Monterey Father Serra with two newly arrived priests and half a dozen of soldiers as an escort set out for a valley in the heart of the Sierra de Santa Lucia, which had been pitched on as a good location for a mission farm. It was about sixty miles south of the Monterey post and had wood, water and fertile land. Four Christian Indians went along as farm helpers,

and a train of mules carried enough corn meal, flour and dried beef to support the little body for a season until a crop could be raised.

Some cattle and sheep also were driven along. When the site was reached the church bells were hung on an oak, a large cross cut and raised and some cabins built of branches for shelter and one for a church. On the 14th of July, 1771, the President formally began the mission and placed Fathers Litjar and Pieras in its care as lawful pastors and legal administrators of its little possessions. The singing of High Mass began this function and the bells were pulled vigorously to announce it. There was no sign of human habitation in sight, but as Mass began a naked Indian stole up to gaze at the spectacle. Serra noticed him from the altar and drew glad augury of numerous conversions here from the fact that a heathen presented himself at its first Mass, a thing which had not happened at either of the two former foundations. Father Serra remained two weeks to make acquaintance with the natives, who did in fact come in numbers from the rancherias, but the difference of language did not allow him to offer any instruction to them. His brother friars when left to themselves took up the task of learning the native language with success while working at the buildings and plantation of the mission.

Another establishment was begun at the same time at San Gabriel, about fifty miles from San Diego. Two Franciscans, Cambon and Somera, were charged with its foundation. The Governor thought there might be danger from the Indians and sent ten soldiers along with the two friars. The lattter spent some time in choosing a site suitable for an agricultural settlement, and finally decided on a spot near a flowing stream which since retains the name of the mission's patron angel. When the party began to raise the large cross which was the first work in every Franciscan establishment, a crowd of natives, armed with bows and arrows, gathered around. The soldiers prepared for an attack, but Somera suddenly displayed a banner bearing a representation of Our Lady which struck the admiration of the savages. They came to lay their arrows before the picture and friendly relations were at once established. The foundation was made in the same fashion as at San Antonio, except that it was not one, but over a hundred naked savages who witnessed its first Mass.

The good will thus established by Father Somera's presence of mind was soon disturbed by the misconduct of a soldier. Some of the Spaniards went to visit the rancherias and an insult to a woman brought on an affray in which an Indian was shot dead. The corporal in command thought it well to strike terror into the natives. He caused the body to be beheaded and the head placed on a pole

before the mission palisade. By urgent remonstrances the friars had it taken down and restored to the tribesmen, but a feeling of distrust on both sides remained. Comparatively few natives would come for instruction to the mission, and the commander at San Diego, though he recalled the homicide soldier, made matters worse by adding six men to the guard. Father Serra in his address to the Viceroy attributed the slow progress of the mission to the number and misconduct of the soldier guard there. Both friars also broke down in health and had to be replaced by new men, which also impeded the growth of intimacy between the Franciscans and the Indians. In addition to the local troubles Lieutenant Fages refused to allow other missions to be established on the plea that a larger force of soldiers was needed in California. Father Serra finally had to send to Mexico and obtain positive orders from the Viceroy before the nineteen Franciscans already in the country could go on with their work of conversion.

The troubles of early mission life are well shown in the report forwarded to Mexico in 1773 by Father Palou, who acted as superior in the absence of Serra. Five missions had been founded in four years and priests were waiting for three more which the military commander did not think safe. In two of the first the whole of the buildings had been changed to other localities five or six miles from the original sites after a year's experience. In San Diego crops had failed two years in succession, and the Christian Indians were living like the savages on wild seeds and berries. The missionaries had sent to San Blas for a fishing boat and nets to help in their support. The Franciscans had only baptized eighty-three, including children, in four years, and of those eight had died. They had married twelve who lived in huts of their own fashion beside the mission church. The priests and soldiers lived in log huts thatched with reeds within a little palisaded inclosure. The church was of the same material, but they had begun the foundations of a church eighty feet long of adobe and had made several thousand sun-dried bricks with the help of the natives when the friars had supplies to feed them. In cattle the establishment had fared better than in agriculture. It had begun with eighteen cows and calves and it now had forty head of beef cattle, twenty-nine horses, twenty-two mules, four asses, seventy-six sheep, fifty-two goats and nineteen hogs. Pasturage was abundant and the stock throve and increased.

In Monterey at the time the Indian baptisms had been a hundred and sixty-five and there had been thirty-two marriages, of which three were between Spanish soldiers and Christian Indian women and one of a Mexican workman with an Indian. There had been eleven deaths, and there were several Indians coming for instruc-

tions who lived in their old savage way as far as cabins and food. They had raised a hundred fanegas or half bushels of wheat the year before, but the padres had thought best to reserve it for seed. The cattle were forty-six, with twenty-eight hogs, but no sheep. The mission had nine horses and twelve mules as well as a blacksmith's shop and carpenter house with all the necessary tools.

In San Antonio the site had been changed on account of the failure of water at the place first selected. In the new location irrigation ditches had been made and wheat, beans and corn planted. The friars, however, had only a bushel of seed wheat, and it would take some seasons before they could hope to have enough to give bread to their converts who meantime lived on pine nuts, acorns and rabbits which they snared. A hundred and fifty-eight had been baptized and fifteen Indian couples married. The latter were all living well content at the mission in their own huts as well as three of the Spanish soldiers who had taken Indian wives. The stock was thirty-eight beeves, thirty hogs, nine horses and eleven mules. The number of mules in all the missions is explained by the fact that all burthens were packed. There is no mention of carts or carriages in the primitive mission life.

In San Gabriel from the causes already mentioned the conversions had been only seventy-three. There were five married couples of natives of the Peninsula settled at San Gabriel and six other Californians and the farming had succeeded better than elsewhere. The live stock was a little less than at San Antonio or Monterey, but was thriving. The Indian population around the mission was very numerous according to Palou's report.

Palou's methodical story gives a clear view of the privations and disappointments of early mission life. The number of the friars who broke down under them was very large. The first missionaries at San Gabriel only lasted a few months, though they afterwards returned with renewed energy to Upper California. Father Cambon even crossed the Pacific as chaplain to a vessel which was transferred from San Blas to Manila. The few conversions of the early years must have been a keen trial to the zealous missionaries who had left home and friends for that object alone. The absence of hostilities with the natives is also noticeable. The burning of San Diego mission was the only real fight recorded. A conspiracy to the same end was discovered there in 1778, and Ortega, the military commandant, executed four Indians on that account. The killing of the Indian at San Gabriel was the only other incident of the kind in the first seven years of mission establishment in the wilderness.

The refusal of Lieutenant Fages to allow any new foundations threatened to stop all hope of making Christians of the Californian

Indians. In this emergency Serra went himself to Mexico and laid the matter before the Viceroy Bucareli. It was well he did, as at the time economists in the Mexican Council were seriously urging the removal of the dockyard at San Blas, without which regular communications would be impossible between California and the outside world. The Viceroy's Council on Serra's representations decided to continue it, and further ordered that every facility should be given the friars for as many missions as they could supply priests for. Fages was replaced as Governor by Captain Rivera, the second in command, formerly under Portola. On Serra's return the work of mission expansion was resumed. San Francisco, Santa Clara, La Purissima and San Juan Capistrano were established before the end of 1779. A new obstacle arose, however, when the northern provinces of Mexico were formed into a government independent of the Mexican Council about this time. De la Croix, a military officer, was appointed Captain General of the frontier provinces with residence in Sonora and a new Governor Neve was sent under his authority to California. The new officials were men imbued with what were called liberal ideas in the eighteenth century, and among them a desire to subject the clergy and religious observances to state regulations on an extensive scale. De la Croix decided to plant colonies of married soldiers and farmers as centres round which the savage Indians might be gathered and civilized by the mere force of example. The friars were to give instruction and administer the sacraments, but were to have no part in the management or settlement of the Indians otherwise. It was in fact a revival of the ideas put forward by the first settlers in the West Indies in the time of Columbus and which had been found so disastrous in practice to the natives. The Captain General went even further in his interference in religious matters. He endeavored to have the Franciscan missionaries in California formed into a custody or province independent of the Missionary College of San Fernando, from which they had been drawn. This in fact would make any regular supply of missionaries impossible, as it was not to be expected that friars like Serra, Crespi or Palou would be found among the newly converted savages. The friars themselves protested against this measure, which, however, was only dropped after several years. De la Croix pushed his meddling in Church affairs so far as to forbid Father Serra from confirming the Indians. Serra had that privilege by concession of the Holy See, but De la Croix insisted that his approval was also needed for the lawful administration of the sacraments of the Church.

His policy was only given up after events in Arizona had proved its folly. Two settlements were made near the Colorado on his

methods, and both were destroyed by an Indian rising. Four Franciscans, Captain Rivera, the former Governor of California, and twenty-five soldiers with their families were massacred in a night. It was only after this blood-stained lesson that the Franciscan friars in California were allowed to continue their work in their own way. San Buenaventura, on the Santa Barbara Channel, was established as a mission in 1782, fourteen years after it had been ordered by Galvez. It was in fact the tenth of the Franciscan missions and the last foundation of Junipero Serra.

Years and work were telling on the President of the missions. In 1784 the number of converts had grown to five thousand eight hundred and over five thousand had been confirmed by the hands of Father Serra. His faculties for confirmation expired in July, and to exercise them in every mission he made the journey from San Diego to Monterey on foot at seventy years of age. He suffered keenly from the inflamation of his leg and an asthmatic affection, but though visibly near his end he continued to teach and pray with the Indians in his mission. Three days before death he superintended a distribution of clothing and provisions among them which had just arrived by sea. The next two days he spent chiefly in prayer and made a general confession of his life to Father Palou. He insisted on going to the church to receive the Communion and received extreme unction while seated on a chair and surrounded by Indians. His bed was only of rough boards covered with a blanket, but even on it he only laid down for a few hours in the night. On the 28th of August he asked Father Palou to recite the prayers for a soul departing and answered the responses clearly himself. When the prayers were ended he remarked: "There is nothing more to fear," and "let us rest." He then lay down on the board couch while all left the room, and quietly passed away alone. It was a typical ending of the life of a typical Spanish friar.

It was noted that conversions increased notably immediately after Father Serra's death. Nearly a thousand Indians were enrolled within the four months following his death. Its lesson was not lost even on the limited intelligence of the natives. The movement continued under the administration of his successor, Father Lassuen, who directed the destinies of the missions for eighteen years in the same spirit as their founders. By the close of the century the Christians settled in the missions amounted to nearly fourteen thousand, and twenty-five thousand had been instructed and baptized during the thirty years of Franciscan work. The primitive huts and palisades of the first establishments had grown into villages of adobe houses with large central buildings for use as granaries, workshops, school rooms and lodgings for the priests and their assistants in the

general direction of the labor of the natives. The value of these buildings and the cattle and other property created by the labor of the Indians was reckoned at nearly a million dollars in 1796. This estimate does not represent anything like the same sum in our days. The missions in 1800 owned sixty-seven thousand head of cattle and horses and eighty-six thousand sheep, all sprung from the three or four hundred which had been driven across the desert from Lower California thirty years before. The industry of the Franciscans had got over the difficulties of the first dry years in the matter of cultivation. In 1800 the crop of Indian raising was seventy-five thousand bushels. That raised by the settlers of Spanish origin, who had gradually come in to the number of over twelve hundred was reckoned at only nine thousand bushels and their cattle at sixteen thousand, with about a thousand sheep. The comparative wealth of the white settlers and the converts under Spanish rule was not very unequal if divided proportionately among each class. To every white a dozen of cattle and a yearly yield of seven bushels of grain would be a fair distribution of the common wealth. Every Indian convert under a similar rule would receive five cattle, seven sheep and about six bushels of grain. It may be added that whatever manufactures existed were entirely confined to the missions and their value should be added to the common stock of the converts.

The list of these industries introduced among the native Indians was rather large. It included the making of wine and oil, of cordage from native hemp, of blankets and coarse cloth from native wool, of soap and tallow, tanned leather and coarse saddlery, salt, pottery and flour. Flouring mills run by water existed in several missions before the close of the eighteenth century. Stone cutting, brick making, carpentry and smelting were among the trades practiced by the California Indians. Mechanics had been brought from Mexico to act as instructors in those branches by Father Lassuen. In the management of cattle and horses the Indians were well skilled, and twice the Military Governors complained that the converts were liable to become as dangerous as the Apaches if any trouble should break out owing to their dexterity as horsemen. It was altogether a remarkable result obtained in thirty years among a race whose condition thirty years earlier was that of naked savages.

The means by which this change was brought about was equally noteworthy. The Franciscans brought the heathen natives to settle around the missions by persuasion alone. When enrolled as residents they had to submit to no more personal restraint than was the lot of most European communities. They were required to remain in their settlements and do the work allotted to them, but if any ran away or neglected work the penalties imposed were very light and

determined by the missionary. In San Francisco when at one time the friar in charge authorized some cases of flogging the Superior, Father Duran, forbade the practice. The military commanders were harsher, but their interference with the mission Indians was limited by the general law unless in cases of serious crimes like murder or rebellion. The instances of the latter were few indeed. The murder of Father Jayme at San Diego was the only instance of violence offered to any of the unarmed Franciscans during the eighty years of their mission experience. In two or three cases individual friars like Father Danti and Father Horra were removed by the Superior for undue severity in the management of the natives, but these exceptions only show the general character of a system which rested on the moral influence of unarmed priests as rulers of a savage population during over sixty years.

Father Lassuen died in 1803 at more than eighty years of age. Vancouver, who visited in California in 1792, describes him as a man of seventy-two, whose gentle manners, united to a most venerable and placid countenance indicated that tranquilized state of mind that fitted him in so eminent a degree for presiding over so benevolent an institution. The Protestant Bancroft declares him the first in California's history both as a man and missionary. "In him were united the qualities which make up the ideal padre without taint of hypocrisy or cant." His management of the missions affords abundant evidence of his untiring zeal and his ability as a man of business. His writings prepossess the reader in favor of their author by their comparative conciseness of style. Of his fervent piety there are abundant proofs, and his piety and humility were unobtrusive, blended with common sense." One asks how many Indian Agents in our own history have merited a character like this Spanish friar's.

Father Tapis succeeded Lassuen as Superior, and during the next ten years twelve thousand converts were enrolled, though only one new mission, Santa Inez, was founded. The lack of new missionaries owing to the troubled state of Spain and Europe during the wars of Napoleon was the chief cause of the arrest of mission development. The Franciscans explored to the east of the coast range and explored Tulare and Kern counties in different expeditions. They examined the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers as far north as Shasta and found numerous sites for missions and thousands of natives, but they had no priests to spare. The whole number in California at the death of Father Lassuen was only forty, and ten years later it was thirty-eight, all employed in the nineteen existing missions. These averaged each a thousand of Indian population, and their management occupied fully the energies of the friars who in addition acted as priests to the white population, which was over

two thousand. The Indian industrial development, however, continued. Cattle of the missions numbered a hundred and forty thousand and sheep a hundred and sixty thousand. The grain yield was nearly ninety thousand bushels. The last companion of Serra, Father Dumetez, died at the beginning of 1811.

The invasion of Spain by Napoleon and the rejection of Joseph Bonaparte by Spanish America made the arrival of new Spanish priests almost impossible. The College of San Fernando was entirely recruited by volunteers from the different provinces of the Spanish speaking Franciscans. The great majority had come from Europe, though three or four Mexican religious had volunteered for the Californian mission. It had been the rule of the college only to send priests for a term of ten years to the difficult task of administering a Californian mission, but in 1815 Father Payeras, the Superior, warned his brethren that they would have all to remain till death, as there was no prospect of others coming to relieve them. A circular of Father Payeras in 1821 on this subject gives a good illustration of the personal habits of the Spanish friars. He had previously warned his brethren against practices opposed to the spirit of the rule of poverty as vowed by Franciscans. The points mentioned were that some of the fathers occupied cells too large and better furnished than Father Serra's, and that others were accustomed to travel on horseback or even in carts instead of making their journeys on foot after the model of Francis of Assisi. The directors of San Fernando had even ordered in consequence that any carts for personal use of the friars should be burned. This regulation was modified by Payeras, who with much simplicity declared that there need be no scruples on the practice in view of the large number of old men among the missionaries. He added that it was their duty to save their strength as much as possible for the benefit of the Indians, even at the cost of abandoning the bodily mortifications which were so dear to most of them as Franciscans. The circular is a strange comment on the "hideous selfishness" in Mr. Lecky's words which marked the lives of Spanish friars in California.

In spite of the horrors of Napoleon's Spanish invasion, nine Spanish friars made their way to California between 1810 and 1820. There were thirty-seven in the missions in the latter year and about twenty-one thousand Christian Indians. The priests had baptized eighteen thousand in the decade, but the number of deaths from epidemics and other causes was very large. The white population had grown to thirty-five hundred, or about a seventh of the population of California. The chief material production, however, was in the missions under management of the friars. Five thousand horses, a hundred and fifty thousand cattle and two hundred thousand sheep

represented the possessions of the natives. In 1821 they harvested a hundred and eighty thousand bushels of grain and furnished flour, cloth, cordage and leather to the whole of California. Trading was carried on to some extent with both Mexican and foreign vessels, American ships being well represented. There were ominous mutterings of secularizing the missions among the politicians of Mexico and Spain, but the general opinion of all the Californians was opposed to it. With diminished numbers the Spanish friars continued to administer their missions for thirteen years after the separation of Mexico from Spain.

The Spanish Cortes, after the downfall of Joseph Bonaparte, had decreed the secularization of the California missions. In 1821 the Viceroy of Mexico notified the Governor of California of this order, but the Governor decided its execution would ruin the country. The independence of Mexico and the frequent revolutionary changes of government there which followed left the California mission system untouched till 1834. The Franciscans were then only twenty-six and the Indian population and their property slightly less than in 1820. Governor Echandia, on his own authority, in 1831, decreed that several of the missions should be made pueblos, and sent commissioners to hold elections among the Indians for town officials to control their affairs. At San Miguel, San Antonio and San Luis the natives voted to retain the existing administration of the friars, and the scheme was abandoned for the time. Ten Mexican friars were sent from Zacatecas in 1833 by the Mexican Government to take the places left vacant among the Spanish friars. Congress, however, did not give much time to try whether the newcomers could carry on the work. In 1834 sixteen missions were placed in charge of commissioners for their administration, and the priests were left to perform religious services exclusively. There were subsequently attempts made to restore the old order, but the mission property disappeared so rapidly under the commissioners that the native population had wandered away. In 1840 the Indians at the missions were less than six thousand, and their cattle had shrunk to one-third of its amount at the date of secularization. The decay continued under the American occupation. The mission buildings and a few acres of ground were confirmed to the authorities of the Church, but the Indian lands and herds were swept away by private spoliation, and the Christian Indians themselves have almost melted out of existence. The last survivor of the Spanish friars who had built up the old missions died in 1875. Father Gonzales, in the words of Bancroft, "was a man beloved and respected by all from the beginning to the end of his career."

One cannot but ask, in the face of the history of California, on

what grounds a large part of the American public is so ready to assume that the Spanish friars of the Philippines must have been an immoral and tyrannical body of men because they have been engaged on a larger scale in work like that of Junipero Serra and Fermin Lassuen. From the first settlements in what are now the United States the conversion of the natives to Christianity has been proclaimed as a desirable object. Men like Bishop Berkeley, Elliott and Mayhew have tried it in New England, but tried in vain. Almost since the foundation of the Republic the statesmen of America have proclaimed the desire of civilizing the savage tribes within its borders, and have spent many millions on the attempt. A hundred Spanish friars in California, with no financial aid beyond the Pious Fund of Mexico, created by private charity and which never gave them twenty thousand dollars a year, have done a work in the way of Indian civilization greater than all that has been accomplished by the Government of this great Republic. That it did not survive their extinction can hardly be laid as a charge against their methods until some agency can be named which even began a work like theirs. If every noble work be condemned because it is not eternal in duration, then the California missions may merit condemnation; but as it is, the Spanish friars must be allowed to have been the truest friends of the natives yet seen within the territory of the United States.

There is a curious resemblance between the old English Protestant idea of the Jesuits and the new American view of Spanish friars. Both legends have arisen from prejudices already accepted rather than facts. It is strange, indeed, for a Californian to find a man of Mark Twain's ability speaking confidently of the "degraded Spanish friars" and wondering whether heaven could inflict a greater curse than "friars" on the natives of the Philippines. The view of mankind which finds only degradation in fellowship with the names of Junipero Serra and Fermin Lassuen and Payenas and Gonzales, with the plea for mercy to the murderers of Father Jayme, with Fuster calmly covering the powder sack with his habit amid the brands of the burning building at San Diego, with the old mission prefect, Father Savria, dying of hunger at the altar in 1835 among the few Indians who still clung around the plundered church must be either superhumanly high or frankly idiotic. In justice to Mr. Clemens we may add that it may be supremely ignorant of the character and history of the Spanish friars so recklessly defamed by him.

Bryan J. Clinch.

San Francisco, Calif.

EDUCATION BY THE STATE; OR, THE EVOLUTION OF A STATE RELIGION.

IN *The American Catholic Quarterly Review* for April, 1899, Rev. William Poland, S. J., declares that "education having run its course for a generation or two with the most important factor, the indispensable factor, excluded from the formula for the problem of human life, wise men are at length awakening, startled by the awful logic of results. And so it is that we have, now, what we may call an ethical movement in education." He lays down his pedagogical thesis that "this ethical movement in education has been planned along paths by following which it is doomed inevitably to be a practical failure." And, again, he says: "The question demands a settlement upon the basis of fact and argument, and not upon the shifting uncertainties of mere opinion."

It would be interesting to follow this ethical movement and see how far it has succeeded or failed. But this is not possible in a general way, because our public educational system is so widespread. Nor has the ethical movement in education extended to all parts of the country yet. The same end can, however, be served by considering the case in some one state.

We have, therefore, endeavored to apply this principle to the educational movement in Minnesota, as evolved by the state authorities; and we here lay the results before the readers of the *Catholic Quarterly*, leaving them to judge how far the facts, in Minnesota, sustain Father Poland's contention that the movement, as planned, "is doomed inevitably to be a practical failure." We have abundant reasons to believe that, as it is in Minnesota, so is it in other states: the results here fairly indicate the results everywhere.

We take our information exclusively from our State Constitution, school laws, Attorney General's opinions, reports of State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the "Minnesota Teacher," during the time that it was the official organ of the Department of Education. We let these authorities proclaim their own doctrines and relate their own facts; and we throw no element of mistrust over the testimony, in the eyes of non-Catholic readers, by introducing even one Catholic authority in stating facts or drawing conclusions.

The necessity for an efficient system of education was kept carefully in view, in what now constitutes the state of Minnesota, from its earliest beginnings as an independent Commonwealth. The qualifications of teachers, the fine character of the buildings, the infusing of zeal and efficiency into the great body of County Superintendents, the jealous care for the fullest development of the Normal

Schools, the establishment of the State University upon a solid and lasting basis, the perfecting of a thorough system of secondary education as a feeder to the University, and the warm advocacy of the rights and duties of the state in securing a thorough education to each and every one of *its children*—were all deemed matters of prime importance, overshadowing all other means adopted for the safety and general prosperity of the state.

In the Organic Act of Minnesota provision was made for the reservation of certain lands, to be used exclusively for the advancement of the cause of education. In the Act Authorizing a State Government, reservation is again made of certain lands exclusively for school and university purposes. When the Constitutional Convention met, the friends of education by the state were evidently again vigilant; and we, therefore, find the following provisions incorporated in the new Constitution:

Article I., Section 16. "The right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed, nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship or to maintain any religious or ecclesiastical ministry against his consent."

Article VIII., Section 1. "The stability of a republican form of government depending mainly upon the intelligence of the people, it shall be the duty of the legislature to establish a general and uniform system of public schools."

Article VIII., Section 3. "The legislature shall make such provisions, by taxation or otherwise, as, with the income arising from the school fund, will secure a thorough and efficient system of public schools in each township in the State. (But in no case shall the moneys derived as aforesaid, or any portion thereof, or any public moneys or property, be appropriated or used for the support of schools wherein the distinctive doctrines, creeds or tenets of any particular Christian or other religious sect are promulgated or taught."—Adopted November 6, 1877.)

The school laws adopted, which bear on the subject of this article, are few in number. Their genesis, however, is an interesting study, giving us our first insight into the mind of the State upon education. References are to sections of Revised Statutes of 1894, and year of enactment.

3648. "All schools supported wholly or in part by State school funds shall be styled the public schools, and admission to them shall be free and without charge to all persons between the ages of five and twenty-one years residing in the district."—Adopted 1877.

3778. "Every parent," etc., "having control of any child . . . between the ages of eight and sixteen years shall be required to send such child . . . to a public school, or private school, taught by a competent instructor, for a period of at least twelve weeks in each year, at least six weeks of which time shall be consecutive, unless such . . . children are excused from such attendance by the board . . . of the school district in which such parent," etc., "resides, upon its being shown to their satisfaction that such parent . . . was not able . . . to clothe such child properly; or that such child's bodily or mental condition has been such as to prevent his attendance at school or application to study; . . . or that such . . . children are taught at home, . . . subject to the same examination as other pupils of the district; . . . or that he has already acquired the ordinary branches; . . . or that there is no school taught within two miles. . . ."—1878 and 1885.

3889. "All school officers . . . may introduce, as part of daily exercises of each school, . . . instruction in the elements of social and moral science, including industry, order, economy, punctuality, patience, self-denial, health, purity, temperance, cleanliness, honesty, truth, justice, politeness, peace, fidelity, philanthropy, patriotism, self-respect, hope, perseverance, cheerfulness courage, self-reliance, gratitude, pity, mercy, kindness, conscience, reflection and will."—1881.

3890. "It may be the duty of the teachers to give a short oral lesson every day upon one of the topics mentioned, . . . and to require the pupils to furnish illustrations of the same upon the following morning."—1881.

3891. "Emulation may be cherished between pupils in accumulating facts in regard to the noble traits possible, and in illustrating them by daily conduct."—1881.

3892. "It shall be the duty of the boards . . . in charge of schools . . . supported in whole or in part by public funds to make provision for systematic and regular instruction in physiology and hygiene, including special reference to the effects of stimulants and narcotics upon the human system."—1887.

3893. "It shall be the duty of all teachers . . . to give systematic and regular instruction in physiology and hygiene, including special reference," etc., "and any neglect or refusal on the part of such teachers to provide such instruction shall be deemed sufficient cause for annulling his certificate."—1887.

3894. "No certificate shall be granted . . . to teach" in the public schools without "a satisfactory examination in physiology," etc.—1887.

3895. "In case of failure to impart said instruction" the superintendent may withhold the apportionment for that year from the district.—1887.

3896. "That the superintendent of public instruction and . . . presidents of . . . normal schools . . . be directed to recommend some suitable text-book, and to furnish the same at cost to the several . . . districts . . . for the study of physiology and hygiene, including special reference," etc.—1887.

3750. Among the branches required for a teacher's certificate are "intellectual philosophy, moral philosophy, civil government, and school law, history of education and the theory and art of teaching."—1893.

Turning to the reports of superintendents, opinions of Attorneys General and "Minnesota Teacher," we glean many interesting facts.

I.

THE PROTESTANTS.

The Rev. E. D. Neill is the first to act as State Superintendent. He has to face a local controversy as to the use of the Bible in the public schools. To extricate himself from so delicate a position he falls back upon the Attorney General, who, in turn, straddles the question in true Protestant style as follows:

"I would call your attention to the fact that in the first sentence of the Constitution . . . there is a grateful recognition of God, and also that the School Law requires 'that no teacher shall be employed who shall not be . . . found qualified in moral character.' Thus, Minnesota, in common with all enlightened countries, recognizes the importance of sound morality. By common consent the morality of the Bible is esteemed superior to the ethics of any book. . . .

"Some profess to be scrupulous in relation to sending children to any public school where moral instruction is given; and others equally honest do not wish to patronize a school where there is no recognition of God. Now, it is unfair that either party should deprive the children of the other of the privileges of a school supported by common taxation. . . .

"I therefore recommend that the teacher, a few minutes before or after the recitations of the day, read a portion of the Scriptures, and unite with the scholars in offering the Lord's Prayer, with the express understanding that when parents . . . make the request, the children of such are not to be compelled to attend the Scripture services."

We here have the first application of the policy steadily pursued henceforth. In cases of difference of conscience upon any point touching religion, the rights of conscience are to be secured by the immediate exclusion of the religious teaching objected to. The Indifferentist, or Non-Religionist, is to prevail; the believer in religious teaching, or Religionist, is to be mercilessly trampled upon,

to secure "harmony" in the schools, and to make them "free to all the children of the State!"

Dr. Neill is succeeded in office by a brother clergyman, Rev. B. F. Crary, D. D. The latter pleads eloquently for the reading of the Bible in the schools, and points out the beneficial effects of prayer and religious exercises in preparing the mind for study and the acquisition of knowledge. He says:

"If the people do not believe the word of God, use whatever *sacred book* they prefer . . . read Milton or a selection from Shakespeare. These three books are the fountains of English literature, . . . and the Bible is incomparably superior to the other two. . . . All sects here believe the Bible, and very many believe it who do not belong to any Christian denomination. . . . To expel our only sacred book from seats of learning would be madness that Pagan superstition could alone justify. . . . We would banish every other reading book from every school in the land in preference to dismissing the Bible. . . . Believing that education will be fatally defective without moral culture, we could not stand by and see the Bible, printed without note or comment, thrust from our schools."—Report, December 5, 1861, p. 48.

The good Doctor need not have waited long to witness the complete upheaval of his little plan for maintaining Protestantism as the State Religion in our public schools, by that very "pagan superstition" which he foresees threatening our educational system. We may feel the less regret for the failure of his plans, from the conviction that they would have proved utterly inadequate to meet the needs of religious instruction in the schools; and would simply have substituted Protestantism for Indifferentism, or "paganism," still leaving the Non-Religionist and the Catholic to be trampled out for the sake of "harmony." For we may as well recognize, right here, the self-evident fact that this whole educational problem involves the question of equal justice to three great divisions of citizens: the Catholic, the Protestant, and the Non-Religionist, Indifferentist, or Secularist.

Dr. Crary pleaded and worked zealously for the predominance of the Protestant Rule of Faith in the public schools; but the Catholics *could* not accept it; and the Secularists *would* not, as they had plans in view, better adapted to their own opinions. These plans soon triumphed; and our glance at Dr. Crary's policy will enable us to realize the great distance to which we have since fallen away, from even this lame and wholly inadequate system! Catholics will see at once that Dr. Crary's system, however well meant on his part, could never be adapted to the proper rearing of their Catholic children; but, should we have any readers who sympathize with his efforts to preserve, at least, some broken fragments of Christianity in our schools, though carefully excluding therefrom the very name of Christ, let them follow us a little further, and see the fate of this system, borne down irresistibly before the insistent demand for a "tolerance of all shades of religious belief;" to be obtained, in practice, *only by the exclusion of all,* with equal firmness, from the school

rooms of our State schools, to be supplanted by what Father Poland calls the "Ethical Movement in Education."

Dr. Crary collected statistics, from the County Superintendents, as to the extent to which religious instruction or prayer was carried on in the schools. The schools in the City of St. Anthony opened with prayer and Scriptures. In St. Paul the course of study included "Elementary Moral Lessons," but no mention of either prayer or Scriptures. In the city of Winona most schools opened with prayer, all with the Scriptures. About 175 districts made reports. Some 52 of these have prayer or reading of some sort, about half of them using the Scriptures. Whether the other half substituted Milton or Shakespeare, as the worthy divine recommended, is not stated! Ten districts are mixed, some using religious exercises, others not. One superintendent reports neither prayer nor Scriptures used, but they soon will be in one of the schools. He is evidently using his influence to this end. One select school is kept in a church, opening with both prayer and Scriptures. One school varies the monotony by closing with prayer. One district has a "Population mixed in religion," hence no reading or prayers. In another "It would not tend to promote harmony" to read the Scriptures or pray in opening school. Has not Holy Simeon told us:

"Behold this child is set . . . for a sign which shall be contradicted." (Luke ii., 34.)

And has not a higher than Simeon expressly declared:

"Every one therefore that shall confess me before men, I will also confess him before My Father who is in heaven: but he that shall deny me before men, I will also deny him before My Father who is in heaven. Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword; for I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law aginst her mother-in-law: and a man's enemies shall be they of his own household." (Matt. x., 32-36.)

But the Jews easily disposed of such exacting claims as these:

"If we let him alone so, all will believe in him: and the Romans will come and take away our place and nation. But one of them named Caiphas . . . said to them: You know nothing, neither do you consider that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." (John xi., 48-50.)

And, interpreting these words to suit their own purposes, the people cried out, a little later: "Away with Him, away with Him; crucify Him." Our county official thus has a strong precedent, far back in history, to sustain him in his method of securing "harmony" in the schools! Later we will find Dr. McCosh echoing the old warning: "The Romans will come and take away our place and nation!"

In one district, reading the Scriptures and prayer "depends upon the teacher." Yet, despite this delicate regard for the "conscience"

of the people, in a large proportion of the districts complaint is made that the people are not interested in "popular education;" and one district official mentions that, amongst the people, "some have to rely mainly on private schools;" evidently, in his eyes, a great disadvantage. Dr. Crary's efforts to blend Christianity and Secularism in the State schools, cover one year; and that year marked the zenith of this strange, mongrel system.

David Blakely next serves for four years. No further effort seems to have been made, during his administration, to push the religious question. Attention is centred upon building up the material features of the system: classifying the schools; securing better teachers; interesting the people in the schools; obtaining better school houses, improved ventilation, and many other things essential to a thoroughly equipped and efficient system of public education—all, of course, under the absolute control of the State authorities.

In June, 1865, a convention of County Superintendents and Examiners, amongst other resolutions, adopted the following:

"Resolved, That there is no interest of a civilized society which is paramount to that of educating the *whole* people and of generating that intelligence and virtue which alone can create, conserve and perpetuate the blessings of national liberty," etc. Therefore, they ask for "the prompt organization and equipment of an independent department of instruction."

State Normal Schools are also started, as necessary for securing teachers of such a high proficiency as is required in properly conducted State schools. The words of Superintendent McMinn, of Wisconsin, are quoted approvingly: "If we are to have State schools for the education of our children, we must also provide State schools for the education of their teachers."

In 1866 H. C. Rogers, Secretary of State, acting as State Superintendent of Public Instruction, makes the annual report. To follow, here, each Superintendent at any length, would be impracticable. We have, however, carefully done so, in our researches for this article; and can, therefore, lay before our readers the cream of our discoveries, as concisely as possible.

II.

THE SECULARISTS.

In 1867 Mark H. Dunnell holds the reins as State Superintendent. He takes hold with a vim and earnestness that recall to mind Dr. Crary's eloquent pleas; but he zealously guides the Ship of State into very different channels in educational work. He deals the deathblow to the Crary system already outlined; spares no pains to accomplish the absolute secularization of the public schools; and ventures as far as he dares, under existing circumstances, towards forcing

every citizen, regardless of religious predilections or conscientious scruples, into these schools, for his education or that of his children. From our copious notes, from his reports, we quote but little here; but that little represents what he repeats, reiterates, and insists upon, in page after page. He points out to the Legislature their duty in this matter; rebukes those poor overscrupulous people who stand back from a "loyal" adherence to our school system, through mere scruples, or so-called "rights" of conscience; and urges on, with every encouragement, those who fall in with his plans for absolutely secular education! We quote a few of his abundant dogmatic utterances:

"The proper and systematically conducted education of the youth of the State is, indeed, a question of far more vital importance than local or material interest can ever become, for it takes hold of those immaterial and otherwise uncontrollable forces which give character to the entire commonwealth." "The State in its adoption of a system of public instruction has recognized its obligation to educate every child within its borders, to meet every aspiration for mental development, for intellectual food, no matter how poorly clad may be the child in whose heart beats this immortal longing."

In 1868 he outlines, on page 65, the policy of the public schools. As usual, his style is strictly dogmatic.

"Obedience to law should be an early lesson. The necessity for law should be impressed upon the minds of the young. Correct views of governments should be imparted. . . . Children thus educated will be intelligent, and go forth practically fitted to take their places in the various spheres of social life." "Our public schools . . . should make them intelligent and thoroughly acquainted with the relations which good citizenship will compel them to observe."

And, in 1869, on page 5, he again waxes eloquent:

"The children who, emerging from the lowly cabin, enter the public school, may find there the golden thread and henceforth follow it till by acquisition they honor the race. The beneficence of common schools is in their absolute and actual freedom."

All through Mr. Dunnell's reports we are impressed by the fact that, although the History of Education is, professedly, one of the most important branches taught to teachers, yet he plainly labors under the pleasant delusion that "absolute and actual freedom" is an entirely new feature peculiar to our modern educational system. Yet, space permitting, facts could here be multiplied, from the history of those golden Ages of Faith, calumniously styled the "Dark Ages," to show how gross and utterly mistaken is his remarkable ignorance of past history on this point! See Hallam, Maitland, Cobbett and innumerable other Protestant historians. Here are a few of his pet axioms:

"A republic recognizes every subject as a part of itself." "Intelligence promotes thrift. Ignorance is blind and timid. It tends to poverty and to crime." "The genius of our civil institutions demands our common schools."

To his fellow citizens he addresses these earnest pleadings:

"I do not hesitate to assert that our common schools should have the warm sym-

pathy and cordial support of every citizen; that no person, institution or corporation, civil or religious, should stand in the way of their full development or withhold support; that these religious organizations have no right to attempt a change in the essentially secular character of these schools." . . . "I cannot sympathize with those who would make these schools a means for the propagation of a faith or the support of a church, nor with those who by an appeal to the law and force of majorities or any custom, however hoary, would do violence to the rights of conscience."

Needless to say, he has here in mind the delicate conscience of the man who utterly objects, like himself, to any tinge of religion in education! He tells us frankly:

"How to secure the attendance of every person who should be in the schools is more radically important that the question whether the Bible be or be not used therein."

Alas! how have the mighty fallen, since Dr. Crary's disappearance from the field!

During Mr. Dunnell's administration petitions were presented to the School Board of the city of St. Paul, praying that some part of the public school moneys be appropriated for the support of schools therein, separate from those known as the public schools of the city. He tells us curtly:

"The prayer of the petitioners in each instance was denied. It is not easy to conceive how any different result could have been anticipated."

He then gives a historical sketch of the action of the general government in its educational land policy. The Congress of Confederation, in 1785, allotted certain lands "for the maintenance of public schools." The ordinance of 1787, for territory northwest of the Ohio, declares that "schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." It provides that certain lands "should be given perpetually for schools." In Oregon and Minnesota lands are reserved "for the use of schools." From all this he jumps to the convenient conclusion that all these grants evidently were meant for public schools *exclusively controlled and managed by the State, from which religion must be absolutely excluded;* although we have failed to find any such statements in his sketch of these various historic assemblies. The statement, in one ordinance, that "schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged," may, with entire propriety, be asumed to infer quite the contrary to Mr. Dunnell's conclusions. He himself tells us that the policy of making grants for religious purposes was early abandoned, while that of "fostering" public schools has been continued. Because it was deemed unwise to contribute to the direct support of religious bodies, as at first proposed, he concludes that religious schools could not claim any State aid, *even for the secular education there given!* We fail to grasp the logic of his argument. He concludes that the schools are

" . . . in a very important sense, governmental schools." "Deadly hostile

to the public weal is the head, or heart, or hand that would lessen the strength of this support to our free institutions." "This is the temple which all must enter, like that which Marcellus erected to Virtue at Rome, through which lay the only path to the temple of Honor." "Our youth need education, and they should acquire it in the public school." "I insist that the government . . . has a right to make provision for their culture, and, indeed, has the right to compel its acquisition . . . for its own existence rests in the correct training of these embryo citizens. For aught it may know, the cloister will sow the seeds of disloyalty and death."

In 1867 Mr. Phelps, Principal of the State Normal School, very properly insists that " to teach truly is to form character, and not merely to impart knowledge." This important truth is constantly emphasized by our State officials. Superintendent Pribble, of Hennepin county, thinks:

"The success of the teacher in moral instructions depends more, perhaps, in the tone of his feelings, his examples and the motives presented to induce correct action on the part of pupils than upon dry formalities or precepts."

But, in the effort to impart this moral instruction under any religious guise, however thin, practical difficulties again begin to crop out! In Le Sueur county:

"The major part of the schools . . . use the books recommended by the department, but some use the Catholic school books. . . . A few teachers have read in their schools a portion of the English version of the New Testament as a morning exercise, and in some of the schools the Catholic catechism has been taught and prayers repeated and learned."

On the other hand, in Sibley county, the local Catholic priest denounced both the schools and the system. He preached an entire sermon on the school system, instead of confining himself to preaching the Gospel! The County Superintendent thus reports his own official view of the matter:

"I understand the policy of this government to be religious tolerance to all, to educate the people in morality . . . and all things useful to man. It belongs to our government to cherish Christianity in its highest sense . . . and to protect every Christian church; not to bestow its patronage upon any particular ecclesiastical body."

A yet sharper thorn in the sides of the State officials is found in the fact that the Catholics, not content with protesting against the prostitution of the educational system to unworthy ends and false teachings, persist in establishing, multiplying and maintaining their own distinct parish schools. Others do the same; but the Catholics are in the forefront in arousing the indignation of Mr. Dunnell. On page 133 Professor Wilson, Superintendent of Goodhue County, states that, in that county, there are "several quite flourishing private and denominational schools." Hamline University, the Episcopal schools in Faribault and Red Wing, and the Scandinavian Lutherans all appear in the list. The State Superintendent calls for statistics upon this subject. In 1867 he finds that:

"The 3,707 above given as not attending any public school mainly compose the Catholic schools at St. Paul," etc., "and the Episcopal parish schools at Faribault,"

etc. "About fifty different private schools have been in session in the state during the year. Many of them have been called into existence and sustained, in consequence of the unsatisfactory character of the public schools at the points where established."

He thus expresses his chagrin at these discoveries:

"Those select schools, which have for their origin no other cause than the exclusive characteristics of a religious denomination, lessen the efficiency of the public schools and foster a spirit not in harmony with our civil institutions, nor do they do justice to the really tolerant character which our public schools sustain."

Despite this plain language, he discovers, in 1868, that:

"The total number of private school students has been about 6,000. It is noticeable that in nearly every place where the public schools have been thoroughly graded, private schools have generally ceased to exist, except in those localities where higher institutions of learning have been established and where the Catholics are in sufficient numbers to sustain separate schools."

The Superintendent of Blue Earth County reports:

"Only one permanent private schools in our county—Sisters of Notre Dame. . . . It is active and thorough, and is deserving of much notice in reviewing the educational resources of our county."

But Mr. Dunnell emphatically declares, in this year's report:

"The exclusiveness of the parochial school makes it un-American. . . . Its discipline is vastly inferior. A wholly inferior scholarship is attained. The child's mind is crippled by the unceasing exactions of the Church of which it is a part. Religious faith, and not mental growth, is the object of solicitude, and is, indeed, the grand purpose of the school."

Yet he tells us, on page 59, that "Seabury Mission, the Shattuck Grammar School and St. Mary's Hall at Faribault, continue to enjoy a high reputation for excellence in discipline and instruction." Meanwhile, the Superintendent of Blue Earth County again remarks, of the Sisters of Notre Dame:

"This school is constant in its efforts and faithful to the best interests of its students. Thoroughly qualified teachers are employed, and it is, deservedly, the leading private school in this portion of the state."

On page 179 the Superintendent of Rice County reports:

" . . . we are much indebted for the improved character of teachers generally in the county, to the college at Northfield, under the auspices of the Congregational Church, and Shattuck Grammar School and St. Mary's Hall, . . . each in a flourishing condition and . . . under the direct supervision of thorough and competent instructors."

Mr. Dunnell made the "Minnesota Teacher" his official organ, and recommended it to the school officials and teachers. This journal gives an account of the meeting of the National Associations, at Trenton, N. J., which, it declares, "was the most important educational council in the history of the nation." It also publishes a communication signed "H.," dealing with this same convention. The writer says that the most important question which absorbed the attention of the Association was the religious question.

"The movement in New York to divide the public funds among the various denominations . . . made the question eminently practical. The principles on

which this claim is asserted by the Catholics are so adroitly stated that many enemies of the plan admit too many of the principles to safely escape the result."

The principles so "adroitly stated" by Catholics are:

" . . . that spiritual culture lies at the basis of all true education, and must ever be associated with it; . . . that in order to secure this result religious instruction must be imparted in our public schools; . . . that religious instruction is essentially dogmatic and cannot be successfully given without being associated with many religious views . . . peculiar to denominations."

He here "adroitly" appeals to our prejudices before proceeding:

"Now these three statements admitted, the rest all follow, and the result is one of the most fearfully un-American in its spirit and fatal in its purport which have ever arisen in our history."

He draws his conclusions as follows:

"It is beginning to be thought by the best educators that the only true ground is found in entirely excluding formal religious instruction from the public school. . . . While, however, formal religious instruction should be left out of the public school, it must be remembered that by far the most potent form of religious culture may still find its way into our public schools, namely, the living example and Christ-like spirit of the teacher himself. This becomes a living intuition to the child and will have an influence over him in all his future career."

In other words: Religion would be an excellent thing in our schools; but the Catholics' argument is so unanswerable that we cannot have it without admitting them to the same privilege; therefore, we must formally exclude religion from the schools; but we must get in, informally, as much of our own religion as we possibly can, without exciting the suspicions of our Catholic fellow citizens. Lest this statement be thought unwarranted, we quote the words of an eminent educator, as given in the "Minnesota Teacher:"

"Religious Education. (The following is an extract from an address by Dr. McCosh, president of Princeton College.—Ed.)"

"I am not sure that it is the duty of the Church to organize a system of education in opposition to the national system. I believe that, even though you were to attempt this in a more thorough manner than you have ever yet done, you could not succeed, so deeply is the national system seated in the affections of the people. Your people, I believe, would not subscribe to such a rival system, and you would never with your teachers rival the well-trained teachers of the State schools. Your exertions should be made in a very different direction. You should seek to support and advance the State schools and labor every way in your power to give them a religious character by rearing pious teachers, male and female, and anxiously striving to get them appointed. . . . Then it is the special duty of the Church to watch that the State system be not undermined. I believe it is in eminent danger of being so at this present time. . . . If the measure passed by the State Legislature of New York become law, we shall soon have Popery taught every hour in the day in schools supported by the State. This is a measure to be resisted to the utmost. Our Church should set itself vigorously to arrest this system of denominationalizing the State schools."—"Minn. Teach.," Vol. III., p. 40.

Protestantism, always dependent on the State for its life and propagation, will control the State, if possible, in such manner as to ostracize all Catholic teaching, whilst making its own the State religion; if this be impossible, it will accept the State's religious or irreligious teachings, as a lesser evil than recognizing, on a footing of equality, the right of Catholics to a like freedom, in propagating their religious faith, amongst all those willing, voluntarily, to embrace it.

Before King Solomon, the false mother readily agreed to the division of the body of the living child between herself and the mother from whom she claimed it; but the true mother insisted on saving the life of the child, whom she so tenderly loved, at any cost. Truly, history repeats itself.

Mr. Dunnell has told us that many of the private schools were "called into existence and sustained, in consequence of the unsatisfactory character of the public schools at the points where established." In 1867, on page 163, the Superintendent of Waseca County says on this point:

"The tendency of the present times is to drive all young men of ability from the teacher's field. People want *cheap* teachers. Young women 'turn their hands' to the business of teaching until they can get married, and that generally happens before they have had experience enough to become good teachers, and that is the end of their 'professional' career."

This is, at least, a high tribute to the personal attractiveness of our Minnesota young women; since, however "cheap" they may be deemed by school officials, there is always some one to whom they prove to be very "dear!" Our Waseca friend points out:

" . . . the importance of making some effort to call into the field a class of educators who will devote their lives and energies to the all-important business of teaching the youth of Minnesota."

Why not the Sisters of Notre Dame? The Superintendent of Winona County says:

" . . . a serious and almost fatal defect is not unfrequently made by school officers in hiring cheap teachers." "The frequent change of teachers has a retarding and damaging effect." "It is important that . . . a large degree of high moral influence be possessed by the teacher . . . and exerted over the pupils of the school. . . . For if no moral restraint shall be brought to . . . influence the pupil, there is danger of recklessness and insubordination."—Pp. 164-165.

In 1869, on page 18, Mr. Dunnell himself remarks:

"Experienced and well-qualified teachers should be encouraged. They should not be asked to teach for less than the teamster receives for his work, but should be so well paid that they can cheerfully labor in the school-room."

On page 183, the Superintendent of Steele County uses these vigorous words:

"The usefulness of our district schools depends so largely upon the quality of the teachers employed that I think the standard of qualifications should be gradually raised, until the ignorant and inefficient teachers, hitherto so abundant in this state, shall be compelled to qualify themselves for their business or abandon

To remedy this evil, in addition to the normal schools, teachers' institutes are encouraged all over the State. Professor Wilson enumerates, amongst the benefits derived from these institutes:

" . . . an enlarged view of the dignity and responsibility of the teacher's vocation; . . . ambition to attain the highest standard which may be exhibited by any teacher; imitation of the best means of instruction and discipline, and an active coöperation in all that is calculated to promote general intelligence."

We may conclude that these advantages are prospective, rather

than in actual realization; for, at the Ninth Annual Meeting of the State Teachers' Association—another organization for increasing the efficiency of the State's teaching force—at the Thursday Evening Session:

"A discussion upon the subject, 'Does the English Language receive the requisite attention of our Public Schools,' was opened by Professor Gilson. . . . The discussion was continued by Messrs. Butts, Hiskey, Roe, Secombe and others. A very likely discussion was had, and the question seems to have been decided in the negative."—"Minn. Teach.," Vol. III., p. 7.

In the report for 1869, page 105, Professor Phelps remarks:

"To be able to write readily and legibly and to keep accurately a system of accounts are attainments which ought to be within easy and certain reach of all. And yet no subjects are more wretchedly taught, if taught at all, in the public schools. . . . Our children at school go carelessly through the ceremony of learning to write for months and years together, with no result in a majority of cases but the acquisition of an illegible scrawl." . . .

On page 185, Rev. A. D. Roe, Superintendent of Washington County, says:

"One of the noticeable deficiencies in the schools is the study of our own language. With the exception of Orthography, it is receiving very little attention. The pupils know little of the meaning of words, and many of the schools that should have well-advanced classes in grammar have only those beginning or none at all."

If the "inferior scholarship" ascribed to the parish schools by Mr. Dunnell is inferior to this, they must indeed have sunk in efficiency! But, at least, the discipline of the public schools is of a higher order? Let us see. On page 101 Professor Phelps says:

"It is a fatal mistake to expend, as we are doing, our main strength upon purely intellectual training. . . . This great error is rapidly working out its disastrous results in our American society." "Have we a right to boast very highly of the culture of our schools, while the cheek of modesty is made to blush at the exhibitions of obscenity which greet the eye in every street? The very crayons that work out the problems upon the blackboards of our splendid school buildings are employed in the shameless work of defacing our fences and public places with language and drawings that are a disgrace to our civilization. This disposition wantonly to deface and destroy private and public property is one of the worst signs of our times. And so, too, we may speak of that spirit of disobedience and insubordination so prevalent among the children and youth of our time. Carelessness, the lack of promptitude in meeting engagements, of courtesy towards associates, of system in the conduct of affairs and of a high-toned sense of honor in the intercourse of business—all these are palpable evidences of a superficial and slipshod method of home and school discipline and training."

His remedy is, to furnish unstinted means for the support of the normal schools. Professor Wilson finds, in his county, a large foreign-born element, who "are honest, industrious and make good citizens," some of whom, especially among the clergy,

" . . . look with distrust upon our common schools; calling them 'heathen schools,' because, forsooth, no system of religion is taught in them. In many of the districts of this county which are settled principally or wholly by Scandinavians the distrust or prejudice above referred to manifests itself by the non-attendance at school of the children of such parents."

He forgets, apparently, that some of these simple-minded people and clergy, who still adhere to old methods of education, under

which they had themselves become "honest, industrious and good citizens," may have known enough of English to read some of the testimony above quoted, as to the condition of our schools at this period. Even in the matter of proper ventilation, they would seem to fail, at least in some instances. The Rev. A. B. Patterson, Superintendent of Ramsey County, declares:

"It is quite a serious matter . . . to visit some of the schools in the winter season, . . . because it is impossible to endure the foul atmosphere for more than an hour."

On page 151 Professor Wilson says, of the agitation for the recognition of religious denominations in our school system:

"To my mind, such a step would be the greatest calamity that could possibly befall our community; . . . if our schools are to be placed where religious dogmas are to be taught, the world will become filled with bigots and its civilization will retrograde towards the dark ages; . . . but the great principles of morality should be the basis of all education. The morality based upon the truths of the Bible." "It ought to be confessed that moral instruction and moral training do not receive the attention in our schools which ought to be given them. . . . On the instant, then, our plans of education ought to be reformed. . . . The cultivation of intellect, while the morals are neglected, is a curse to the individual and the State. An educated man is a thousand times more dangerous than an ignorant one." "The great principles of morality are . . . the same with all denominations and sects." "Moral instruction should be given greater prominence than it has heretofore occupied—that kind of moral instruction which is conveyed not so much by illustrations as by the constant, daily *example* of the teacher," etc.

He quotes Mr. Hancock, Superintendent Cincinnati public schools:

" . . . What we most need is that our youth should be taught by the daily lessons of the school to gain complete mastery over themselves; that they should have their wills strengthened to resist temptations to illicit pleasures; that they should be taught the grandeur of unselfishness, with a sacred regard for truth, which is the basis of all nobility of character; . . . to have them daily educated into such a high sense of honor and integrity as will, in the midst of a venal age, make them scorn to do a mean or dishonest thing for a present advantage, and, finally, to have their characters so fortified at every point that the powers of evil shall not prevail against them."

Meanwhile, Mr. Dunnell had found an opportunity to go to Congress as a representative from Minnesota, and resigned his office as Superintendent. Professor H. B. Wilson, who has made so clear and strong a profession of faith in the State's Religious Creed—Morality without Religion—now succeeds to the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction, on August 1, 1870. In the report for that year he says:

"If I were asked what I believe to be the most disastrous element in our system, that which prevents in the greatest measure the complete success of our district schools, I should answer, next to the need of better qualified teachers, the frequent change of teachers."

He continues to enforce Mr. Dunnell's favorite doctrine:

"I have elsewhere said that our schools are purely secular in their character; that they are State Institutions, and are directly the outgrowth of the necessity of a republican government."

He quotes at great length the Connecticut School Report for 1870,

as embodying his "exact sentiments." We reproduce these passages:

"Our school system should be unsectarian." "Sectarian schools as a system for the masses have everywhere failed. . . . The two systems, common and sectarian schools, cannot co-exist." . . . "Our schools may be unsectarian and yet not irreligious. It is poor logic which contends that unless they are positively religious they must be infidel or atheistic. . . . Our teachers are largely religious persons. By example as well as precept they are seeking to implant the divine law of love in the hearts of their pupils. . . . True, learning may become a splendid implement of evil, and it has often been made to minister to man's corrupt desire. But what may not be perverted to evil?"

The "poor logic," of which this writer here complains, seems not to be confined to our own times. It comes echoing down the ages, in very familiar words:

"He that is not with Me, is against Me; and he that gathereth not with Me, scattereth." "Either make the tree good, and its fruit good: or make the tree evil, and its fruit evil: for by the fruit the tree is known. O generation of vipers, how can you speak good things, whereas you are evil? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of a good treasure bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of an evil treasure bringeth forth evil things." (Matt. xii., 30, 33, 35.) "I know thy works: that thou art neither cold, nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot: but because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold, nor hot, I will begin to vomit thee out of my mouth; because thou sayst: I am rich, and made wealthy, and have need of nothing: and knowest not, that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." (Apoc. iii., 15-17.)

We find Leo XIII., bearing in mind this stern rebuke administered to the bishop of olden times, declaring, in his utterances on education, that religious and secular instruction must go hand in hand, *pari passu*, and cannot be separated or taught independently of each other. And, strangely enough, our Connecticut Report goes on to furnish arguments in the same direction, very clearly, thus:

"Nor is intellectual culture a mere neutral thing, having no influence upon morals. . . . The mind is a unit, and however we may analyze and sub-divide its powers, we cannot address and develop any one faculty independently. They are so interlaced that the right culture of any one in some measure quickens and develops others also. When, for example, the teacher seeks to train the eye to the close and exhaustive study of objects, he is at the same time, however unconsciously, educating the faculties of conception, memory, imagination and reason. . . . So between the mental and moral nature there is a certain connection . . . and reciprocation of influence which cannot be severed nor interrupted without doing violence to our whole nature." . . . "There is no *necessary* connection between knowledge and virtue. The intellect should not usurp the place of the conscience. It may enlighten, but it cannot vitalize that highest of all our powers—intellectual and moral." . . . "Were it possible to secure this unnatural separation, and could we have but one, unquestionably moral training is more important than intellectual. . . . Each mutually quickens and invigorates the other. For its fullest development and efficiency the intellect needs the aid of the conscience, and the highest achievements of the mind will not be effected when the soul is dark and debased. Moral culture has a tendency both to awaken and sustain mental activity, while moral degeneracy induces a dimness of intellectual vision, and sometimes a perfect palsy of the mental powers."—See "Minn. Report," 1870, p. 59.

Perhaps this writer's words will be listened to by those who would regard any Catholic utterance of like import as necessarily open to suspicion. He writes as one given to serious thinking, and drawing deductions from actual experience; and his words are far more

than sufficient to offset a thousand utterances of a mere theorizer like Mr. Dunnell, as to the influence of religious schools, in dwarfing the intellect and preventing the fullest freedom of intellectual development.

At the Tenth Annual Session of the State Teachers' Association, held in Mankato, in August, 1870, the question of "Moral training in common schools" was fully discussed. The address of Judge A. A. Harwood, of Owatonna, "drew out a warm and sharp discussion, in which the strong feelings of the disputants became apparent. The issues were Catholicism and politics." We do not wonder at the disgust manifested; as the speaker's address was filled with stale old so-called historical facts, calumniating the Catholic Church in pretty much every syllable uttered from start to finish. One or two Catholics present, having a little information, outside of the "history of education" taught in our State schools, called the speaker down quite mercilessly. Dr. McMasters poured oil on the troubled waters by "a few pleasant remarks."

"He remembered the time when it was a matter of great doubt whether it was the duty of the State at all to shoulder the responsibility of conducting the affairs of education. We now recognize the fact that all the children of the State are its property, and that it is responsible for their education." . . .—"Minn. Teach.," Vol. III., p. 488.

Mr. Dunnell reveled in the frequent repetition of the phrase "subjects of the State;" but even he did not reduce them to the plane of mere "property!" But we are advancing rapidly in these matters, as Dr. McMasters here intimates. Professor Wilson believes that the Legislature should merge all our different public educational agencies into one State system:

"It is the aim and policy of the State to make her public schools of so high a character that private schools for the purpose of primary and elementary instruction will become unnecessary." "These schools over which the State exercises a supervision are free from partisan or sectarian instruction, and being open to all, . . . it is to be regretted that any class of our people should refuse to educate their children therein. It is manifestly the duty of every citizen of our free government to labor for the time when so just and beneficial a plan for educating the youth shall be embraced by all."

He collects statistics of the private and select schools in the State; and ascertains that "the aggregate attendance of pupils in these several schools, including the three Normal Schools and the State University, was 4,030. . . . The larger proportion of the pupils attending these schools are reported as having attended no public school." He mentions quite a list of "the most prominent" of these institutions, including Catholic, Episcopal and Lutheran primary and higher schools, and tells us that "These several institutions are in a flourishing condition."

In 1870 President Folwell, of the State University, thinks that, as a system of secondary education, it might be very desirable to

adopt the New York plan of incorporating other colleges and higher institutions as a part of the State system, with some financial aid, based upon a thorough State examination in the branches required. The idea appeals strongly to his sense of fitness and propriety, and even justice and equity; and he points out positive advantages that would accrue to the State schools from the competition—for excellence in standing—between them and the denominational schools. He holds

"That the Church has no proper business with university education, which *is secular*. But I allow that there is noble work for her to do in the field of secondary instruction, at least, alongside of our public high schools. . . . When our public schools are as plentiful and cheap as in some of the petty kingdoms of Germany, it will be time enough for us to forbid private parties from interfering in education."

At the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the State Teachers' Association, held in Normal Hall, Winona, in August, the relation of Seminaries and private institutions to our educational system "was discussed by Rev. J. B. Allen, of Groveland Seminary; President W. W. Folwell, Bishop Whipple and others." Bishop Whipple says, in part:

"The Common school, the Normal school and the University are the endowments of the State. The deep necessities of the State created them. They are our common heritage. With my whole soul I protest against their perversion to give power into the hands of any sect or party." . . . "The things wherein we differ are our opinions, and the opinions of one class of men can never become the bond of union for all men." "There are truths that underlie all obligation."

He gently expresses the hope that he has said nothing to wound any heart, in laying down what he believes to be correct principles in education. Can we recognize, in this courteous gentleman of the world, a member of that College of the Apostles—one wearing the mantle of authority of those men—who, standing before the council in Jerusalem, were thus addressed:

"Commanding, we commanded you that you should not teach in this name: and behold you have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine: and you have a mind to bring the blood of this man upon us. But Peter and the Apostles, answering, said: We ought to obey God rather than men." (Acts v., 28-29.)

Here, again, we have the distinguishing trait between Catholicity and Protestantism everywhere. The Founder of Christianity made a profound impression upon the Jews by this same distinguishing trait:

"And it came to pass: when Jesus had fully ended these words, the people were in admiration at His doctrine. For He was teaching them as one having power, and not as their scribes and Pharisees." (Matt. vii., 28-29.)

In 1872 the Principal of the St. Anthony Falls Graded Schools tells us that "about one-third who attend any school are provided for by the Catholics, who keep up schools of a private character." And, in 1873, Professor Wilson says:

"Certain classes of the community refuse to patronize the public schools because instruction in religion is prohibited in them. Religion with such individuals means the peculiar sectarian dogmas to which *they* can subscribe."

He then notes, on page 62, from the inaugural address of President Curran, before the Ohio State Teachers' Association:

"The alienation of the public funds of the State to the support or furtherance of any form of religion would be revolutionary, and should be met first by exhausting all the means for its prevention which our laws afford, and then by an arbitration, which has been the usual court of appeal in such cases."

And then President Curran exultantly cries out:

"The secularization of our public schools is all but accomplished. The acts of worship are omitted or are very meagre. The schools are generally conducted in such a way that no religion is taught in them. . . . The great element of moral culture in school is not an inculcation of a feeling of religious obligation, but rather the creating and fixing of habit of industry, a submission to justly constituted authority and a respect for the rights of others. I wish to be able as a school man to assure any man that his child shall receive no peculiar religious bias from the schools."

The testimony of such a man, as to the conditions existing in a community where this school system predominates, ought to command respect from advocates of similar views. We, therefore, reproduce the following words, from this same address:

"When we look abroad upon the life of our people we tremble for the safety of republican institutions. Theft, robbery and murder in the slums and alleys scarce keep pace with defaulting, embezzling and bribery in the higher walks of life. Lust demands its holocaust of victims every lustrum, and tardy justice lags by the wayside. Liberty has degenerated into license, and society writhes in throes in its endeavor to rid itself of the noxious elements. The daily press teems with exposure of vice, and the English language is taxed for invectives against crime. The ignorant have suddenly become rich, and think that their children must not submit to restraint. They forget that the foundation of all prosperity, the basis of law and order, the entrance way to happiness, is *obedience*."

Meanwhile, the parish schools continue to prosper. The Superintendent of the St. Cloud Graded Schools tells us that "The Catholic school is largely attended." From Goodhue County we learn that "there are about twenty parish or church schools, . . . with an aggregate attendance of about 1,300 pupils. . . . The German Lutherans have three parish schools." Wabasha County has its "Catholic school at Wabasha." The table of statistics, on page 252, shows the number of parish schools to be rapidly increasing.

In 1874 Professor Wilson mentions that Carlton College "is rapidly growing in importance and usefulness." At Shattuck School the "course of study is complete; its faculty able, and the instruction thorough." St. Mary's Hall "is admirably conducted." At St. John's College (Catholic) "the instruction is very thorough." St. Mary's School at St. Cloud, Cathedral Parochial School at St. Paul, and a number of others, are all classed "among the other flourishing private schoools of the State." The Superintendent of Ramsey County has the names of twelve private or parochial schools, "all located in St. Paul." On page 202, Superintendent Roe bears testimony "that St. Croix Valley Academy has done very much to raise the standard of education in Washington County." In Winona County "4½ per cent. of the scholastic population attend parochial schools."

D. Burt, Superintendent of Winona County, succeeds Professor Wilson as State Superintendent, in 1875. He wants the school funds distributed proportionately to all *scholars* only; but expressly excludes scholars not in the public schools! He insists that "No just claim can be made by any church, or sect, or party, to a share of this income from school funds;" but he, of course, excepts the sect, or party, of Secularists, of which he is a member, and claims every cent of it for them alone! He says:

"It was meant that this income should be so applied that it will aid in meeting the expenses actually incurred in the education of scholars in our public schools. . . . It cannot be claimed for the educational benefit of persons who are pupils in private schools. It must be used for the education of scholars in our public schools. This reasoning is sound, but it proceeds on the assumption that scholars in our public schools, and not persons out of school or scholars in any other kind of schools, should 'draw the money.'"

It is sufficient reply to note his admission that this is an assumption, necessary to sustain his argument; and to add that it is a mere assumption, not upheld by the historical facts which he cites in its support. Indeed, he himself seems to realize this; for he continues:

"Why not, then, take away even the shadow of a claim on the part of private schools to our school fund by asserting the principle that as the money is *used* for scholars in the public schools, such, and such only, shall '*draw* the money?'"

This frankness is, at least, above all possible misunderstanding. We, the Secularists, have already appropriated this fund for our own use exclusively; now, it only remains to declare that restitution shall never be made, of any part of it, to our fellow citizens who dare to give any religious instruction to their children! We have already seen that, a little later, in 1877, they were actually successful in passing an amendment to the State Constitution, providing that none of this money "be appropriated or used for the support of schools wherein the distinctive doctrines, creeds, or tenets of any particular Christian or other religious sect are promulgated or taught." Their admissions of the efficiency and thoroughness of these schools, in discipline and instruction, are constantly renewed, year after year; but they also teach religion; therefore, they must be branded as outlaws from all rights under our educational system. Toleration! Liberalism! Equity! Americanism! ye are jewels indeed!—as catchwords to gull the simple voters!!

A merciful Providence seems to compel these men to convict themselves out of their own mouths. On page 49, in 1875, Mr. Burt, treating of the school system in Germany, expressly declares: "The element of private schools in the German system is not a disturbance; it cannot be called a blemish. Such schools are under a general public supervision and they contribute an important influence for the education of the people." In this country he could not approve such a system because our people must be "Americanized."

Next to "Religion," we know of no word so sadly abused and made to cover so much real rascality as this word "American," or "Americanism!"

Speaking of those who object to our schools on religious grounds, Mr. Burt, with a magnanimity truly worthy of his sect, graciously acknowledges that their legal right to establish parochial schools "cannot be questioned, as long as they pay the public school taxes assessed upon their property, and abstain from attempts to secure support for their schools from our State fund, given by our national government for a broader purpose." This latter statement is true in a sense far different from Mr. Burt's intention. The funds were given to "foster and encourage education." Mr. Burt and his partisans restrict their use exclusively to the schools controlled by the Secularists of the State, and expressly exclude from all share in it their Religionist fellow citizens. The government purpose was "broad;" Mr. Burt's is narrow and offensively intolerant! And, like his predecessors, he consoles himself with the reflection that even this toleration may not long be necessary. "It is not certain," he remarks, "that this class of schools will be permanent. The descendants of those now educated in them may be found in the public schools of the future."

Alas! for his fond hopes! On page 105, the Principal of the Graded Schools at Austin states that "but a little over one-half of those of school age have been in attendance. This may be partially accounted for by the existence of Catholic parish schools, which are quite well attended." In Blue Earth County "the Catholics of Mankato have just completed one of the largest school buildings in the State." In the city of St. Paul alone "it is fair to estimate the total enrollment" in private and parochial schools "at 2,000." Sibley County: "The Roman Catholic society have a school house, a two-story brick, . . . valued at about $1,500, . . . with an enrollment of 65 pupils." Steele County has "had a few private schools in different parts of the county. . . . Two of them are German, and I am informed that one is Norwegian." In 1876, page 86, Mr. Burt complacently remarks:

"It is being generally conceded that state schools, supported by popular taxation and designed for all" (just so, Mr. Burt!) "can distinctively teach neither Judaism, Christianity nor atheism. They are not to be Lutheran, Calvinistic nor Armenian. They must not espouse orthodoxy, heterodoxy, nor any doxy. Our state schools must restrict themselves to the teaching of the virtues, personal and social, that are essential to the welfare of the state and sanctioned by conscience in general." "Sentiments like this can be inculcated in our public schools . . . without necessarily reading them from any book to give them authority."

And he adds:

"The public desire to preserve the harmony of the schools and to make them acceptable to as many persons as possible will lead to the waiving of anything dis-

tinctively religious to which persons entitled to object shall make any decided objection. . . . The tendency in this direction is so positive that the matter will regulate itself without any legislative interference."

Yet they clinched it, the next year, by their new constitutional amendment. Meanwhile, the Superintendent of the Graded Schools of Stillwater receives a stunning blow. He sadly announces:

"At the commencement of the present year the Romanists opened simultaneously six parochial schools. This has thus far decreased our total enrollment of one year ago ninety-seven names. The Lutherans (German) have also a small parochial school established here."

In 1878, in Goodhue County, "The only private schools . . . at present are parochial schools;" the Lutherans "are intending to open a Norwegian Seminary." In Olmstead County the

"statistical report shows a decrease since last year in the number of scholars enrolled. This is owing to the opening of the Catholic convent at Rochester November last. Over three hundred are enrolled in this school. At the Rochester High School, the convent and High Forest Seminary students can now prepare for the state university."

In Steele county "the Minnesota Academy and the Sisters' school afford excellent opportunities to our young people to obtain an education." The Principal of the Osseo Graded Schools regretfully admits, on page 167:

"The French citizens of Osseo have supported a school during the past year which has taken thirteen pupils from the public school, leaving still twenty-four French pupils. The French school is for boys only; its main object to give religious instruction."

Henceforth the State Superintendent reports biennially, instead of annually. We note, on page 42, amongst the text-books used in the University, in 1879:

" . . . lectures by Matilda J. Campbell on Practical Ethics, History of Ethics, Philosophy of Ethics, Evidences of Christianity, . . . History of Natural Theology and Philosophy of Natural Theology; History of Civilization, Guizot; Mediæval History, Greene; . . . General History, Swinton." . . .

To prevent being misled by these titles, we must bear in mind that President Folwell is acting upon the principle that University education is outside the domain of the Church, being *purely secular*. Ethics, Evidences of Christianity, Theology, Philosophy, and Mediæval History, taught from a purely secular standpoint, must, indeed, be invigorating and enlightening to the human intellect which is subjected to such a process! Perhaps, after all, we were too hard on Judge Harwood. If he was put through this course, we could not expect any better knowledge of the Middle Ages than he displayed in his unfortunate address, previously alluded to.

President Folwell now practically retracts all that he had previously written in favor of encouraging church schools, at least in secondary education. On page 59 of this year's report, he states that, in his judgment, the new law for the encouragement of higher education has already

"performed a useful service. It has directed the attention of a large body of the people to the fact that the State has or may have a complete system of public instruction, . . . reaching from the alphabet to the degree of master of arts. The people are thus organizing their own education, and are not to accept any part of it as a charity at the hands of contending sects and orders."

Our worthy president has proved an easy convert to exclusive control by the State (the Secularists), even in secondary education; where he was inclined to allow some little justice, to deserving institutions, not accepting State dictation in their theological and religious branches of study!

D. L. Kiehle, Principal of St. Cloud Normal School, draws attention to another of the supposed advantages of our public school system:

"Closely allied to the library is the reading-room. If our youth are to be progressive, they must be brought into sympathy with the life and thought of the age. If they are to continue and to improve as vigorous thinkers and students they must be trained to the intelligent use of the only possible substitute for travel and immediate contact with men, which is found in current literature, periodicals and newspapers. These are instruments for information with which every student should be familiar."

The Superintendent of Cottonwood County reports:

"The large settlement of Mennonites in this county take very little interest in American schools, preferring to educate their children in German parochial schools."

In 1880 Mr. Burt feels called upon to take up the cudgels, to defend the public schools against a growing dissatisfaction, altogether independent of mere religious considerations. He has remarked, shortly before, that thousands of children from these schools "are making life successful." On page 205 he repels the charge that the schools are responsible for juvenile ignorance of trades. He does not attempt to deny that such ignorance exists. He remarks: "For such parental folly our schools cannot be held responsible. They are not designed to take the place of the family or the church." Yet they wish to control the child's education—from 5 or 6 to 18 or 21 years of age—to fit him for all the duties of life!

Professor Kiehle succeeds Mr. Burt, and submits the report of 1881-1882. He gives high praise to those who have supplied private and Christian schools, to provide such instruction "as they believe the State unable or unprepared to give." But he thinks "it must be most reasonably expected that those who professedly represent Christian philanthropy will stand prominent in support and loyalty to the State in this its highest calling," now that it "has undertaken . . . to give every child an education, . . . to care for every unfortunate one."

The new law of 1881, providing for instruction in "social and moral science," or the new State Religion, which has been so often foreshadowed in the successive reports of our State Superintendents, had just gone into effect. It now became necessary to interpret this

new Religion, prepare proper text-books, define its dogmas and precepts for the guidance of the teachers, and provide in other ways for its practical enforcement in the schools. Mr. Kiehle's energies are zealously bent upon these new and responsible duties. The State Normal Board passed the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, Several school boards have already ordered that instruction be given, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the law, and a demand has already arisen for teachers who are fully competent to perform this important work in the best manner; therefore,

"Resolved, That the presidents of the normal schools be directed to make such provision as may be necessary to prepare their students to give instruction to the scholars of the State on the several subjects enumerated in the law, and . . . the board further directs that, in treating the subject of temperance, special prominence be given to the physiological effects of alcohol in the different liquors when used as a beverage; that the highest scientific authorities be consulted, and the dangers and evils resulting from the use of intoxicating liquors be carefully pointed out."

Mr. Kiehle mentions the following catechism of the new Religion:

"The following questions upon this point were prepared by Superintendent A. D. Roe, for the examination of teachers in Washington county."

Here are a few selections:

"All Grades—1882.

"1. What do you understand by Moral Science? Have you ever received at school any direct instruction on the subjects embraced within this topic?

"2. Name six of the moral principles in which instruction in school seems most needed.

. . . . . .

"5. Define Temperance. Give also its present popular signification. . . .

"6. What do you understand by Social Science? Can you draw any distinct line between Moral and Social Science?

"7. Name a few of the virtues which seem to you more especially social ones. . . .

. . . . . .

"9. Do you think a teacher can exert a good moral influence who indulges in pernicious habits, even though they are such as are not reckoned immoral?

"10. Will you earnestly strive to teach by precept and example all moral and social principles in your school?"

Mr. Kiehle adds:

"It is the hope of the friends of popular education . . . that the product of our school system shall not only be scholarship, but a noble manhood established in morality and intelligence."

And now he, in his turn, discovers still another new danger threatening the children of the schools—from that familiarity with "current literature" and newspapers which he advocated at the Normal School—in fact, already working terrible havoc in their ranks. On page 32, report for 1881-1882, he remarks:

" . . . it is notoriously true of the children whom the State has taught to read, and for whom it has done so much more at great cost, that large numbers are reading literature which is rapidly undermining every principle of loyalty to good government, all respect for religion, every pure affection for home and family, every habit of industry and economy, and all incentives to virtue and an honorable life, threatening to fill the land with a race of intelligent tramps, demagogues and libertines." "The full remedy is found only in the combined efforts of the family and the State."

Strange how these men, after insisting that the State must control these children, run to the family or the Church, or both, when they

wish to elude the responsibility for the results of the State's exclusive control of the moral and mental development of the child!

We learn, on page 81, that amongst the books in the library of the Mankato Normal School are the "Works of Herbert Spencer, Max Mueller, Tyndall, and Huxley; . . . and many other educational, biographical, historical and scientific works of scarcely less repute." And the poor aspirants for positions as teachers, having filled their unprepared, half-developed, and unprotected intellects with all this stuff, go forth to mould our children to sound morality and virtue! In 1881, Section 3,682 of the Statutes of Minnesota, as compiled in 1894, first became law. It provides for the use of school houses

"for purposes of divine worship, Sabbath schools and such other purposes as . . . will not interfere with the use of the school house for school purposes."

Our lynx-eyed Secularists soon saw the danger underlying this seemingly innocent enactment; and the Attorney General renders an opinion that

"This statute . . . was never intended to be used as a cloak or subterfuge to enable the school trustees to use the school house and the teacher employed therein with public school moneys to conduct religious worship in connection with such school."—Cole, pp. 110, 118.

This year the Superintendent of Ramsey County tells us that "in St. Paul there is a large number of parochial schools—mostly Catholic and Lutheran—with an attendance of about fifteen hundred scholars."

In 1883-1884 Mr. Kiehle is much impressed with the fact that "the term of common school instruction extends through about eight years of the youth's life, years intermediate between the family and citizenship;" and, in 1885-1886, he tells us that these are the "years in which the time of the child is most valuable in being his only opportunity of preparation for active and responsible manhood." And yet, for his lack of knowledge of a trade, his inability to read or write, and his insubordination and disobedience, the parents or the Church are made responsible, whilst the schools are exonerated from blame! Truly, we are moved to remark, under the exclusive control of either the family or the Church, no worse botch of this whole business could possibly be made than we find is made by the State (Secularists), on its own showing.

Mr. Kiehle constantly urges the enforcement of the State's newly discovered system of Social and Moral Science. He declares:

"I am convinced that much is lost in the general neglect of teachers to present, in clear outline, the principles of personal, social and political morality. A good and practical work on the subject, for the help of our teachers, is much needed."

Just think of it! During the nineteen centuries intervening since

Christ's life upon earth, we find no "good and practical work" on morality that can be used in our public schools, until Mr. Kiehle points out this marvelous omission, and calls for the production of such a book! He adds the comforting assurance that

"... several text books have been prepared, which incorporate instruction in the effects of alcohol and tobacco upon the person and character with the subject of hygiene and physiology in general."

In 1887-1888, on page 146, we find this edifying example of the zeal of Superintendent E. A. Engstrom, of Goodhue County, for temperance work:

"For several years it has been the invariable custom to require all candidates for certificates to answer the following questions in writing:
"Do you smoke, or use tobacco in any form?
"Do you ever drink intoxicating liquors?
"Do you ever visit saloons?
"I never knowingly issue a certificate to any person who cannot truthfully answer the last two in the negative."

Our Secularist friends are now becoming restive under the compulsory law. Somehow or other, some arch enemy has had private schools included in the provisions of the law, and the Secularists feel wrathful over this unfortunate occurrence. Superintendent J. B. Velikanje, of Brown County, says:

"... our compulsory law ... should be amended in such a manner as to bring every child of the State between the ages of 6 and 16 years to attend the public school at least six months in the year. No proviso for private, sectarian or other schools should be allowed to be inserted, but a plain law passed emphasizing the words *each child of the State* between certain ages *must* attend a *public school* during a certain period of the year. ... The daily attendance should also be regulated by law and no parent allowed to keep the child at home except in case of sickness."—Report 1889-1890, p. 115.

Superintendent C. L. Greenough, of Dakota County, declares:

"The public school should be patronized. The State has a right to insist that it should be. If there are those who will persist in not patronizing it, they should be coerced into patronizing it."—P. 118.

On page 133 Superintendent A. P. Cooper, of Lac qui Parle County, thus swells the chorus: "Children between the ages of 8 and 16 should be compelled to attend school and no provision but physical defect should be made."

Finally, on page 138, Superintendent R. MacKay, of Meeker County, states that, in order to make the compulsory law "effective, its enforcement must be placed in other hands than those of school boards."

Like all his predecessors, Mr. Kiehle finds his path strewn with thorns, in attempting to carry out the latest experiment of the Secularists in educational work. His sayings, on this subject, present a striking example of the mental confusion to which an Apostle of Intelligence is reduced, in his attempts to uphold the new State Religion. He says:

"The state has been somewhat embarrassed, in defining the duties of its teachers

in this important subject, because of the very intimate relation of morality to religion, instruction and training in the latter of which belong exclusively to the family and the Church."

He dwells upon the vital necessity of moulding the immigrants from other countries into a common American type, by means of our schools. For all this, "the public school is the only institution provided." He concludes that

" . . . the only wise policy for the State to pursue is to include in the public school curriculum whatever belongs to intelligence and morals and to leave to the family whatever belongs distinctively to religious instruction."

Mr. Burt had thought that the Religionists might be allowed to have their own separate schools as a sort of toleration, so long as they kept hands off the school funds; but he is already old-fashioned, in this rapid march of the Ethical Movement in the paths of Progress and Reform! Listen to this lucid (?) declaration from Mr. Kiehle:

"To the objection that morals cannot be taught apart from religion it may be said (1) that from the religious standpoint objection has been also made against the State teaching many other branches, as history, natural and mental science. . . . Without refuting these views in argument, the State has . . . made ample provision for instruction in these branches . . . with the result that the objections that appeared in theory have been very generally dissipated by the experiment. . . . Now, as it is more important that our youth should be instructed in the duties they owe to their fellow-men as neighbors and as citizens than that they should be taught philosophy or astronomy, it seems reasonable that the State should be able to discharge this duty without damage to other interests.

"(2). It may be further said . . . that the source, authority or basis of any law or truth necessary to the welfare of the State is not a question in which the State is interested, or one to be settled before the State can appropriate it to its own use. . . . Government in its theory and history is a subject taught by the State without deciding what is the origin of human government, or what is the basis of its authority. . . .

"This principle applies with equal reason to morals. Without considering the question of the basis of moral obligation, or who are its authoritative exponents, it may be assumed that, whatever the source, the world is in possession of a large body of morals, the reasonableness and authority of which are beyond question, and these truths . . . the State may wisely incorporate in its system of instruction and practice."

There could scarcely be a more convincing proof of the terrible extent to which our school system has already debauched, degraded and confused the intellectual and moral faculties of the human soul, and destroyed its natural distinctions between right and wrong, than the bare fact that such plain denial, of even the necessity of a *claim* to legitimate authority for its teachings, by the State, could be gravely formulated by one of its Superintendents, and as gravely accepted by thousands of his readers, and impressed upon the minds of the children in the schools! What a pity it was, indeed, that our Blessed Lord had not sufficient foresight to see that Messrs. Dunnell, Burt and Kiehle would, in future ages, devise such a perfect system for the complete regeneration and civilization of the human race! How much needless suffering He could have saved Himself, by remaining in His heavenly home, instead of devising the extraordinary means of the Incarnation and Redemption! We say this in all reverence and love, merely to bring out in bolder relief the

rank blasphemy of this system, based on *necessity* in preference to Divine Law; on Might in preference to Right! With the same dogmatic assurance Mr. Kiehle concludes:

"It appears from this that the State has made reasonable provision for moral instruction and that it now devolves upon those who are in charge of the schools to give effect to the law by such methods as commend themselves to their wise judgment. And so perfecting our schools they will command the confidence of good and loyal people."

With this proud consciousness of duty well performed, and confident expectation of the great moral reform that is to sweep over the State, through the instrumentality of the new Religion, Mr. Kiehle gives place to W. W. Pendergast, who presents the report for 1893-1894. This gentleman is entitled to our sincere pity. He soon discovers that he has been saddled with an uncomfortable load to carry. On page 36 he remarks:

"What the wisdom of the future will evolve as the clarified ideal of true education no one has the prescience to forecast." "The necessity of some adequate training to fit the young for after life"—he means in this world, not the next—"is admitted. What shall be the character of that training? Here comes the clash. Fierce assaults are being made upon our system first from one side and then from the other." He concludes that " 'Manhood is the perfect product of the loom of life,' and moral training is its most important factor."

On page 113 the Superintendent of Kittson County takes a hand in dogmatizing:

"We hold two propositions as true: First, the child has a right that the state give it an education; second, that the state has the right that the child be educated for citizenship. The child when adult must obey and serve the state, and the state must make it understand its duty."

Mr. Pendergast submits the report for 1895-1896. In 1895 the Attorney General, by a clearly expressed legal opinion, thus finally disposes of the remnants of Dr. Crary's system of Protestantism:

"You inquire whether it is lawful to open a public school with a recital of the Lord's Prayer. The question involves a construction of section 16 of article 1 of the Constitution. . . . 'Nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship.'

"In the absence of that provision, I should not hesitate in answering your question in the affirmative. . . . Wisconsin and Minnesota, so far as my examination extends, stand alone in respect to such a provision. In the first named state the supreme court . . . held that the reading of the Scriptures in a public school was in violation of the Constitution, in that it compelled one to support a place of public worship. (State vs. School District, 76 Wis. 177). No occasion has arisen for a construction by our own court of the said provision. It was held by one of my predecessors at an early day . . . that the reading of the Scriptures is a matter over which the Board of Education . . . has complete control. (Op.-Attys. Gen., 83). But on a later occasion it was said that 'when the use of the Scriptures in a common school is objected to . . . on account of religious or conscientious scruples, their adoption as a text-book is improper and the pupil may decline to use them.' . . . (Op. Attys. Gen., 229.)

"No distinction can in principle be drawn between the opening of a school with prayer or the reading of the Scriptures, so far as the question pertains to the violation of the provision above named. . . .

"It is the purpose of the law of this State to permit no intrusion into our public schools of any religious teachings whatsoever. They are to be kept purely secular in character, and as places where the children of parents of every shade of religious belief may assemble for purposes of instruction in authorized subjects and incidental moral improvement. . . .

"In view of the decision of the Wisconsin court, you are advised that the prac-

tice, however frequently tolerated or indulged in, is violative of the constitution." —H. W. Childs, Attorney General, December 10, 1895.

A little later we find a case decided in Minnesota as follows:

"In the case of Rasnick, vs. District No. 60, Stearns County, April 24, 1897, in the district court it was held that a public school house cannot be used either in or out of school hours for the purpose of giving any religious instruction or the conducting of religious exercises therein, . . . particularly . . . for the saying of any of the prayers or the teaching of the catechism, or . . . conducting . . . of the religious exercises mentioned therein."

This shuts out the last device for Catholic instruction in the schools. Both Catholics and Protestants are thus effectually outlawed from the public schools, unless they accept the terms of the Secularists, who are now in supreme control. It only remains to ascertain, if possible, the practical results of the New Religion, in developing the character of the pupils, and fitting them for "making life successful." Fortunately, Messrs. Pendergast's and Lewis' testimony is at our disposal. The former has now had four years of experience, of the workings of Mr. Kiehle's carefully evolved system of Social and Moral Science; a system brought forth with much travail, carefully nursed with unfaltering solicitude, upheld by drastic legal enactments and shielded by succeeding Attorneys General, from all attempts to weaken or impair its symmetrical beauty and perfection. As to scholariship, Mr. Pendergast's testimony is clear and emphatic. On page 44, report for 1895-1896, he says:

"From the primary school to the post-graduate department of the university English needs closer attention, with a view to securing a plain, serviceable use of our mother tongue. In the common and the higher branches, in the school room and on the school grounds, in written and oral examinations, we find the same lack of ability to use it accurately and readily. Our schools are probably not worse than those of other States, but the conditions in this respect are so bad as to suggest that we should endeavor to remedy our shortcomings with the least possible delay. The degree of its ability to understand and use English is, perhaps, the best index to the quality of a school's scholarship, strength and refinement."

Mr. Pendergast serves for another two years; and we then find the last report at our disposal, submitted by his successor, Superintendent J. H. Lewis, for 1899-1900. It contains, on page 37, the substance of a paper, read by Mr. Lewis, before the State Teachers' Convention in St. Paul, on December 28, 1900. In this paper—after stating that many of the teachers, usually found in the schools, are persons whose ambitions all tend to professional careers, and who are making their work of teaching simply a stepping stone to some other profession, and naturally instil the same hopes and preferences into the minds of their pupils—he continues:

"It is not strange, then, that defects are to be found, and have been found, in our educational systems and methods; that patrons living in cities feel disappointed in the results of the schooling their children have received; that it has not afforded them skill required in their business; that it has made them discontented and restless in the pursuits and vocations of their fathers. It is not strange, then, that the professions are overcrowded—that college and high school pupils engage reluctantly in manual and industrial pursuits. It is not strange that children in rural schools lack interest in all agricultural pursuits; that, in consequence of their training, the bright, aspiring youth have been leaving the farm and seeking to

live by their wits in the cities; that this process has continued until in the older settled states of the East and Middle West the intelligent, independent, cultured farmers have been displaced by a class of tenant farmers, many of them foreigners who have not yet assimilated American ideas, and that all these changes have transpired notwithstanding the fact that the invention of farm machinery and the multiplication and cheapening of comforts have greatly ameliorated the conditions of farm life. Do not the circumstances point unmistakably to the fact that public education in the rural districts has failed in adapting itself to existing conditions and to meet the demands made upon it?"

Thus we find, on the free admission of our last State Superintendent, that, far from advancing the interests of the community, our State school system has actually retarded and impeded it. The testimony, from start to finish, has all pointed to the facts, that the elementary English branches are not learned in our schools, that the scholars are not fitted for commercial or business careers, that they are positively unfitted for agricultural pursuits, that simple reading and writing are not learned by them so as to make a "plain, serviceable use" of the English language, and that no progress worth noting has yet been made in developing in them such a moral character and intellectual vigor as will make good citizens and noble men and women! And—bear it well in mind—these are the conclusions of our school officials, without one word from any Catholic source, or a single charge of our own.

Is it not the verification of the Apostle's saying, ages ago, that "without charity" (the love of God) "I am as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal?" How the grandiloquent phrases of Mr. Dunnell have resounded in our ears, and the words "Progress," "Civilization," "Conscience," "Popular Education," and a dozen others, have been dinned into them all these years! And this is the grand result!! Listen to the Sacred Words of our Blessed Lord, which He addresses to the stubborn and headstrong Jews:

"And He spoke also to them a similitude: Can the blind lead the blind? do not both fall into the ditch? The disciple is not above his master: but every one shall be perfect, if he be as his master. And why seest thou the mote in thy brother's eye, but the beam that is in thy own eye thou considerest not. . . . Hypocrite, cast first the beam out of thy own eye: and then shalt thou see clearly to take out the mote from thy brother's eye. For there is no good tree that bringeth forth evil fruit: nor an evil tree that bringeth forth good fruit. For every tree is known by its fruit. For men do not gather figs from thorns: nor from a bramble bush do they gather the grape. . . . And why call you me, Lord, Lord: and do not the things which I say? Every one that cometh to me, and heareth my words, and doth them: I will show you to whom he is like: he is like to a man building a house, who digged deep, and laid the foundation upon a rock; and when a flood came, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and it could not shake it: for it was founded on a rock. But he that heareth, and doth not; is like to a man, building his house upon the earth without a foundation: against which the stream beat vehemently, and immediately it fell: and the ruin of that house was great." (Luke vi., 39-49.)

III.

THE CATHOLICS.

We had not intended to do more than apply Father Poland's words to our Minnesota School System, and see how his predictions, based

upon principles clearly stated, would tally with the actual results of experience here. But to close without at least indicating what remedy we would advocate, might lay us open to the charge of criticizing others—which is comparatively easy—without having anything better to suggest. We will, therefore, say that, in our humble opinion, the Hon. Zach. Montgomery, in his pamphlet, "Poison Drops in the U. S. Senate," published some years ago—and endorsed by scores of prominent educators and public men, Religionist and Non-Religionist—points out clearly the practical remedy for existing evils in our system. It is, in substance, simply to treat the entire community on a basis of absolute equality.

The school funds should be used to "foster and encourage education" amongst all the children of the citizens of each state. The religious question should be eliminated entirely. We have no more right to ask whether a child is learning the Catholic catechism or the Masonic ritual, before we will apportion him a percentage of the school fund, than we have to ask our carpenter or bricklayer what his religion is before we will employ him to build our house, or the voter before we will permit him to cast his ballot. All men, regardless of their religious or irreligious predilections, are entitled to equal rights under our form of government; but, under the specious pretext of getting rid of dissensions in religious matters, the Secularists have "adroitly" thrown dust in our eyes, whilst relegating us to the rear with the brand of dishonor and ostracism imprinted upon us, because we think our children should receive a religious education.

In other words: our Secularists are narrow, illiberal, intolerant, un-American, and intensely bigoted. Unhappily, as we have already seen, our Protestant fellow citizens, in the great majority of cases, are but little better. They would like to have Protestantism in the schools; but, rather than allow Catholics to have Catholicism, they throw in their lot with the Secularists; and their forces are united to keep out the common enemy, as they choose to consider their Catholic fellow citizens.

The Catholics alone dare to boldly challenge their allied opponents to a "fair field and no favor." They ask that the school funds be distributed, on the basis of actual results obtained in the secular studies now equally required by all in their respective schools. They neither seek nor desire to compel Protestants or Secularists to come into their Catholic schools for their education. Both may retain their schools as at present; but let the distribution be amongst *all* scholars between the required legal ages, according to actual progress shown, upon examinations by state officials or examiners, in the secular branches required by law. If these children are attending Jewish, or Catholic, or Masonic, or Protestant schools, that is

not the business of the State officials. "For if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it, lest perhaps you be found even to fight against God." (Acts v., 38-39.) It is not for these officials to meddle in religious matters, either to command or to prohibit the study of religion. That is the sacred and inviolable prerogative of the child's parents, or of the child himself. Now, in actual practice, these officials prohibit it, and punish those who study their religion as directed by their parents, or as their own conscience enjoins, by excluding them from all State aid in the acquisition of secular learning.

This proposition of the Catholics will never be granted, despite its absolute fairness and justice, if the leaders of the Secularists can keep the whip hand over their deluded disciples. Only the other day they undertook to put a bill through the Missouri Legislature, placing all private schools under the control of the district school boards of the State; but, by the vigilant promptness of the Catholics and Lutherans, the iniquitous proposal was defeated. In our Catholic dependencies they are promptly cutting off the Catholics from their legitimate share in the school funds, on the same shallow pretences as here in Minnesota.

But fair-minded citizens, who see clearly that our school system, as now conducted, is a miserable failure, and a positive evil, may yet bring about its readjustment on the lines suggested here, if they unite their forces patriotically, and declare that it is time for narrow, sectarian bigotry and prejudice to be laid aside, and for all to act together, as citizens, for the common good, without outlawing any section of the community on account of their religious predilections.

May God hasten the day when this happy state of affairs shall be brought about, and we shall be freed from the bitter humiliation of seeing crime and immorality rampant in our fair land, whilst State officials usurp parental rights, and the Secularists coolly appropriate that fund, to which all are equally entitled, as the citizens of one and the same Commonwealth, united under one and the same Flag, and enjoying the blessings of one and the same Constitution!

LORENZO J. MARKOE.

White Bear, Minn.

Scientific Chronicle.

THE PURIFICATION OF SEWAGE.

Comparatively few cities are so situated that the sewage can be disposed of by the method of dilution, which consists in carrying it out into the ocean or into large rivers where the flow of water is upwards of a hundred times as large as the amount of sewage. The great danger then of contaminating the water supply makes methods other than the dilution method imperative.

Out of the other six methods that may be employed two are of the past and four are at present in use in different localities either singly or in certain combinations. The two discarded methods are farming and chemical precipitation. The former consists in the application of the sewage to cultivated land for the purpose of fertilization. The latter method separates the polluting part of the sewage from the water by precipitating it by the use of chemicals. Generally speaking, the city sewage averages only about seven pounds of solid matter to every thousand gallons. To remove this waste and return the water pure is the problem that must be met. The chemical method would be good had it to deal with this waste matter only, but in every liquid ounce of sewage there are approximately 150,000,000 bacteria or microscopic organisms. These must also be removed in any perfect treatment of the sewage.

The four modern methods are based on the principle that the micro-organisms or bacteria play a very important part in purifying the water by destroying the noxious substances contained in the sewage. For this purpose proper conditions are required, and it is the object of these methods to offer the suitable conditions for the purifying action of the bacteria. These methods are known by the following names: intermittent filtration, contact bed treatment, septic tank treatment and continuous filtration.

Intermitten filtration consists in passing the sewage through sand. The sewage is allowed to flow on the sand for about six hours out of every twenty-four, and the sand is underdrained so that the water runs off clear and can be emptied into streams without any fear of pollution. This method is favorable to the retention, growth and action of the bacteria. The preservation of the bacteria is brought about by the fact that the sand offers suitable air spaces for these organisms. By this process about 75,000 gallons of sewage can be filtered per day on one acre of sand.

The septic tank method is nothing else but the detaining of the

sewage in an open or closed cesspool for from twelve to twenty-four hours. The flow of the material through the tank is so regulated that it spends that time in the cesspool. During the time in the tank putrefaction takes place by the enormous growth of the bacteria. The bacteria remove or change the polluting substances, much of which escapes as gas from the tank, giving it the appearance of a boiling mass in hot weather. By this means, combined with the preceding two classes of bacteria, those that need oxygen, or the ærobic, and those that do not, or the anærobic, operate in the process of purification, and if combined an amount five times as great as by the former method alone can be treated in the same time.

The contact bed treatment consists in running the sewage rapidly into a water-tight tank filled with cinders, coke or broken stone, leaving it there for a few hours and then running it off rapidly. The purification consists in the action of the ærobic bacteria, and if a piece of the filling material be examined it will be found to be covered with a slimy growth composed chiefly of bacteria. The one objection to this method is a mechanical one, namely, that the vacant spaces are soon so choked up that the capacity of the bed is thus reduced.

Continuous filtration is merely an attempt to avoid the long periods of rest required in the intermittent system. This is done by supplying air to the bed at the same time that the sewage is admitted. It is claimed that this permits of such a rapid growth of the bacteria that a long rest in the bed is not required and that as a consequence much larger quantities can be treated in the same time. This method is still in the experimental stage and the weight of opinion among authorities on the subject of the purification of sewage is in favor of the septic tank treatment as the preliminary step to be followed by the intermittent filtration method.

LIQUID FUEL.

The development of the petroleum industries of the world naturally calls attention to the use of petroleum as a fuel in many of the cases in which coal has heretofore been used. The enormous output of petroleum in the United States and in Southeastern Russia is well known, and now there are rapid strides making the development of this industry in the Dutch East Indies.

That large quantities are already consumed as a direct source of light instead of gas, which is a coal product generally, and that other large quantities are employed for heating in oil stoves is well known. We are not, however, in general, so familiar with the fact

that it is now supplanting coal as a source of heat for motive power on a large scale. The use of oil as the source of heat in locomotives for railway travel has already passed the experimental stage in Russia.

There are two types of engines employed on the Russian railroads depending on two conditions. The oil may be used only as an auxiliary fuel, coal being principally used, or the engine may be designed for the consumption of oil only.

Examples of the latter type of engine are found in the heavy freight engines that are employed on the Moscow-Kazan and the Trans-Siberian Railways, also in the passenger engines on the South-eastern Railway of Russia. These engines have no grate, only a cylindrical furnace furnished with oil burners. The lower portion of the furnace is filled with fire brick so arranged as to form flues, through which the air passes before reaching the burning oil. The average consumption of naphtha for these engines is given as a little over six gallons per mile. So successful have been the results obtained with these engines that there is now no hesitation in building engines in which only petroleum or petroleum residues are burned.

When oil is only an auxiliary fuel the engine has a grate for the burning of the coal and an additional attachment whereby oil may be fed to the fire. The object of using oil in this way is to get up steam more rapidly when it has gone down or when high grades must be ascended. The liquid fuel is delivered through annular jets placed above the fire door, the oil being pulverized as it enters by means of steam jets. The suction of the steam jet draws in through the centre of the burner the air necessary for the combustion. This air is previously heated by passing through heaters in the smoke box. On the Eastern Railway of France they have introduced oil as an auxiliary fuel to be used on the heavy grades between Paris and Belfort.

The oils usually employed are light enough to be easily atomized by the action of the steam jets, but if heavier fuels be used, such as coal tar, it must be rendered more fluid by placing steam coils in the supply tank. The heat from these steam coils increases the fluidity of the coal tar and it is then easily pulverized by the steam jet.

In connection with this growing use of oil as a fuel, the experiments of Mr. Charles E. Lucke at Columbia University are of interest. In the employment of oil as fuel the method of use was to break up the oil by means of the jet of steam and actually spray into the furnace a mixture of oil, steam and air. Mr. Lucke does away with the mechanical spraying of the oil. He delivers it directly into a mass of broken rock which has been previously raised to a red

heat by means of gas burners. The heat of the rocks converts the oil into a vapor and as such the oil burns. The heat of the burning oil is sufficient to keep up the temperature of the rock and thus continue the process of the vaporization of the oil.

In the experiment made it was found that with every kind of oil tried that the results were the same. Three fires burning side by side and consuming respectively kerosene, cylinder oil and linseed oil, showed no perceptible difference in their mode of action. The residue oils, so called, leave no residue when burned in this way.

APPLICATIONS OF LIQUID CARBONIC ACID.

The great advance made in the liquifaction of gases has led to an increased use of these gases in different lines of industry. Of none of the gases is this more true than of carbonic acid. This is due to the fact that it was one of the first and is one of the easiest to liquify, and hence one of the cheapest to obtain in sufficient quantities for application in the arts.

The preparation of the gas in sufficient quantities and in a sufficient degree of purity demands attention. First there are in certain localities a natural supply of the gas, but up to the present a very limited use has been made of this gas as a natural product in volcanic regions. Secondly, in the process of brewing, the transformation of glucose into alcohol liberates not only small quantities of glycerine and succinic acid, but also a quantity of carbonic acid about equal in amount to the alcohol formed. The gas thus formed is very pure, but the process of formation is so slow and the difficulty of collecting the gas is so great that little use has been made of this source of supply. Thirdly, there is the old and for a long time the principal method of obtaining the gas. It consists in the action of sulphuric acid in limestone. The gas thus generated always contains salts of lead and entrained sulphuric acid. These impurities cannot be removed from the carbonic acid by the ordinary methods of purification.

For the above reasons these methods are abandoned when the liquid carbonic acid is required for use in the arts. The chief source of the gas in practice is usually connected with some other branch of industry. Furnace gases, for example, which contain a large percentage of carbonic oxide may be burned completely to carbonic acid gas mixed with the other gases with which the carbonic oxide was associated. If this mixture is passed through a scrubber and then through sodium or potassium carbonate, and if the other gases with which it is associated are not absorbed by the alkaline car-

bonate the carbonic acid will be separated and remain absorbed in the carbonate. Exposing this solution of the gas in the carbonate to the action of heat usually supplied by steam coils the gas is given off. The gas thus given off is pure, requiring only filtration through charcoal and drying by sulphuric acid or calcium chloride. The gas is then liquified by lowering its temperature and subjecting it to pressure.

One of the uses to which this liquid gas is put is as an agent for refrigerating purposes. It is efficient for this purpose during the time that it is returning again to the form of a gas, because to bring this change about heat is required and neighboring bodies furnishing this heat will be cooled. Suitable machines for obtaining this effect on a large scale exist and they are of much smaller dimensions than similar machines in which ammonia is used as the refrigerating medium. The liquid carbonic acid is also used for the carbonating of water, the enlivening of malt liquors and in the now familiar sparklets. It also finds application in tanneries to remove the lime that has been used to take the hair off skins, for purposes of sterilization, for extinguishing fires, for contracting hoops on guns by cooling, and for the compression of steel ingots on account of the great pressure produced when it is brought to high temperatures. In every chemical laboratory it is extremely useful in enlarging the field of investigation at the lower end of the scale of temperature.

Suggestions have been made to utilize liquid carbonic acid as a motive power, and although several motors have been constructed, still they have not proved satisfactory. It may, however, find a field as such in æronautics or in submarine torpedo work.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION AT PITTSBURG.

This year the American Association for the Advancement of Science held its meeting at Pittsburg on the last day of June and the first three days of July. While the meeting was not as largely attended as were many previous meetings, still the 435 members present were undoubtedly active scientific workers, for there were 350 addresses and papers presented before the different sections. There were at the same time gatherings of affiliated societies which brought the number of scientific men present up to about 600.

One of the important features of this meeting was the adoption of several amendments to the constitution. The effect of these amendments will be to strengthen the organization. Hereafter the Council will yearly elect three members at large, which will add to its efficiency. The different sectional committees will become sort of

sub-councils, with the term of office of the secretaries of these committees extended to five years. The business of the Council is facilitated and the time of its sessions reduced by the delegation of duties to an executive committee made up of the secretaries of the Association and the secretaries of the several sections, for the session on the Saturday preceding the week of meeting. All these changes are in the line of advancement and for the better achievement of the end of the Association, which is advancement in science.

The membership of the Association is now about 3,450, which marks a considerable increase during the past year. The financial condition of the Association is also very satisfactory. The permanent funds of the Association now amount to about $12,500, derived chiefly from savings from income. This year the permanent secretary handed over $2,000 from current income to the permanent fund.

The investment of this fund permits the Association to make appropriations for research. Although these are small in comparison with those of the British and French Associations, still they are increasing yearly, and with the careful management of the funds which characterizes the Association, it will soon be a powerful factor to aid science by the financial help it will give investigators. At the Pittsburg meeting the only grants that could be made were five of $75 each to committees on blind vertebrates, on the relation of plants to climate and on the velocity of light. To committees on anthropometry and on the atomic weight of thorium a grant of $50 each was made.

The meetings of the Association have been held in the summer months, but a trial of a winter gathering is to be made at the next meeting, which will be held in Washington, D. C., during vacation week, from December 29, 1902, to January 3, 1903. It is expected that the change in time will be favorable and that one of the largest gatherings of the members ever witnessed will be seen in Washington during vacation week.

THE GULF STREAM.

For years the popular theory advanced to explain the mild climate of Western Europe was to picture the warm Gulf Stream bearing its genial influence to the shores of Europe. This theory was proposed fifty years ago by Lieutenant Maury. This theory still has its admirers, but is entirely disregarded by oceanographers and meteorologists at the present day.

Faith was first shaken in the Gulf Stream theory when it was conclusively proved that the Gulf Stream ceases as a distinct current

southeast of Newfoundland and entirely disappears before reaching the middle of the Atlantic.

The advance in meteorological science offered the true explanation of the mild climate of Western Europe when it was found that the Gulf Stream did not reach there. In substance the explanation is as follows. In temperate zones the drift of the atmospheric currents is from west to east. Hence all those shores and countries in temperate zones that lie to the east of oceans receive this atmospheric drift of current after it has passed over the water. These air currents in their journey over the water take up moisture. In the process of the evaporization of the water heat becomes latent, and this latent heat is given out again when, over the land the moisture condenses into clouds and rain. Thus the circulation of the air over the northeastern Atlantic by distributing the moisture and warmth of the ocean over Western Europe preserves its mild climate. The reverse is the case for those shores that receive their air currents after they have traveled over the land.

Professor Cleveland Abbe, in the *Monthly Weather Review*, and Harvey M. Watts, in *Scribner's Magazine* for July, have both contributed very good articles exposing the fallacy of the Gulf Stream theory.

A NEW THEORY OF WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

The development of wireless telegraphy remains at the present the most popular field of investigation in electrical science. Hence any new explanation that is offered of the working of wireless telegraphy must be noted. While the theory put forward by Mr. Rankin Kennedy cannot be said to be new, still put forward in the face of the almost universally accepted belief that the working of wireless telegraphy is due to the transmission of electric energy by means of Hertzian waves, it has all the appearance of an entirely new theory.

He rejects the Herzian wave theory on the ground that he cannot see how these waves can bend around the curved surface of the earth through many degrees of arc. Hence he has recourse to an electrostatic disturbance transmitted on the surface of a charged body to explain the phenomena. He regards the earth as an electrically charged sphere with the charge residing on the surface and at zero potential. Through the connection of an insulated capacity and a spark-gap electrostatic disturbances will radiate out in ever widening circles traveling around the spherical conductor. They will, of course diminish in intensity as they recede from the centre of disturbance, but directly opposite the point of disturbance on the other

hemisphere these electric surges meeting in the same phase or crest to crest like two water waves should augment each other. Such an effect could be detected, for an instrument actuated at the antipodal point when it remains undisturbed either side of it shows a resultant effect at that point. A vessel equipped with receiving instruments sent to Auckland Island could test the truth of this theory.

NOTES.

Platinum.—Platinum is the rarest of our metals, and because it resists the corrosive action of the acids it is necessary for the manufacture of many pieces of chemical apparatus. The report of new finds of this metal which may supply it in commercial quantities is of interest. Platinum has been found in two localities in Washington, near Princeton and at the Olympia mine on Kennedy Mountain. Tests of the ore from the latter place show the metal to be present in paying quantities. A thorough investigation of the claim is making to determine the amount of platinum available. Platinum has also been found in the Klondike, nuggets of the metal being frequently found mixed with the coarse gold. The Canadian government has sent an expert to examine these finds on the Yukon. Up to the present the chief source of the supply of platinum was the Ural Mountains, and the yearly yield has been small when compared with the demand. The average annual production is about six tons, and it sells at from $150 to $170 per pound.

Briquettes.—The manufacture of briquettes has become a very important industry in Germany. They are made from brown coal, peat and the dust and waste of coal mines, and they form the principle fuel for domestic purposes in Berlin and other large German cities. They are also used extensively for locomotive and other steam firing in different industries. The advantages claimed for the briquette are that it is clean and easy to handle, that it lights easily and quickly, burning with a clear flame, that they make practically no smoke and are cheap. We learn from consular reports that the output of briquettes is controlled by a syndicate and that it amounted to 1,566,385 tons last year. The purchasers are classified as follows: The German railways, 749,208 tons; factories, 497,136 tons; German merchant steamers and the navy and export, 149,089 tons, and retailers, 124,380 tons. The average selling price per ton when bought in quantities, during the present year, is $3.16. One of the results obtained by the use of these briquettes on a large scale for different purposes in a city is the absence of smoke, which is such a nuisance in many of our American cities where bituminous coal is

burned. The introduction of this industry in the United States would result in the utilization of enormous quantities of material that is at present going to waste. The immense quantities of coal screenings at our mines could be turned into a good and cheap fuel. To make briquettes of this material a binder is required, and the extent to which this material is utilized in Germany may be gathered from the fact that the syndicate used 116,946 tons of mineral pitch, which on account of its plasticity and inflammability serves as a good matrix. Economy could also be practised in this country by converting the bituminous coal into coke and gas, both of which serve for heating purposes. Thus the coal would be used up fully and the enormous waste of useful material which escapes through our chimneys be prevented.

To Redeem the Sand Hills of Nebraska.—There are fifteen millions of acres of unproductive land in the sand hill country of Nebraska. Geologists believe that the centre of the State, where the sand hills are, was once an inland sea, and that the sandstone deposits of this sea have crumbled under the action of the prevailing northwest winds. The sand is piled up at right angles to the direction of the wind, that is, from southwest to northeast. The hope of redeeming this arid waste is based on the fact that no matter how dry the season or how long the hot winds have been blowing, the sand at a depth of only a few inches below the surface is always moist, and there is a very general belief that a great underground flow of water drains the whole region. A tree that could send its root far enough down into the sand would then always secure sufficient moisture, no matter how dry the season. The bull pine is such a tree, for it has a long tap root which it sends straight down into the ground and which would reach a sufficiently moist soil beneath the dry sandy surface. The President has recently approved of the plan of converting this desert into a forest by declaring 211,000 acres of the public lands of Nebraska forest reserves. Two reserves are created, one the Dismal River Reserve, containing 86,000 acres, and the other the Niobrara Reserve, with 125,000 acres. The work is under the Bureau of Forestry, and the division of tree planting has its experts at work in selecting suitable localities for tree planting. The plan is to select small plantations in the most favorable localities and plant out about four or five acres in each of these places, and then by gradually extending these plantations have them merge into one large forest. This experiment is watched with great interest, for its success means the reclaiming of vast tracts of land in the Middle West. It also marks a new departure for the Bureau of Forestry, for it declares its scope to be, not only the protection of existing forests, but also the creation of forests by artificial methods.

The Rusting of Steel and Its Prevention.—By the rusting of steel

is meant its oxidation or its chemical combination with oxygen bringing it to the condition of a hydrated oxide. This change does not take place in dry air at the ordinary temperatures nor in moist air that is free from carbonic acid. For the rusting of steel we require the combined action of moisture and carbonic acid. When rusting once begins the deterioration progresses rapidly. The recurring series of chemical actions assigned is briefly the following: Ferrous carbonate is first formed, and this is oxidized to ferric oxide, the rust, with liberation of carbon dioxide. This latter acts on a new portion of the metal and the corrosion goes on. The rusting of steel becomes a serious problem in steel structures and must be guarded against. The practice among engineers has been to protect the steel with a covering of concrete. This method is regarded as very efficient. In lime water or in soda solution the metal remains bright. The lime is the preserving agent. Portland cement contains about 63 per cent. of lime and in hardening it absorbs carbonic acid and becomes coated with a film of carbonate. Enclosing then as it does the steel in this protective coat it prevents deterioration. Where it has been possible to examine steel girders that have thus been covered, it has been found that after the lapse of even fifteen years there was no sign of rusting. Such is the conviction among engineers as to the value of cement in protecting iron from rust that a wash coat of cement is given to the exposed surfaces of girders. As an illustration of this faith in cement it may be noted that the engineers of the Boston Subway after investigation and careful testing adopted Portland cement paint for the protection of the steel beams of the structure. In the same way in which Portland cement neutralizes carbonic acid, so it protects iron from the attacks of other dilute acids, such as the sulphurous and sulphuric acids that result from the combustion of coal.

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Notices.

THE LIVES OF THE POPES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES. By the *Rev. Horace K. Mann*, headmaster of St. Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Vol. I., Part I., A. D. 590 to A. D. 657. Part II., A. D. 657 to A. D. 795. Price per part, $3.00. Received from Herder.

The almost complete absence of works on Church history written by Catholic authors in the English language has been a long-standing subject of complaint; and the call for such works has been emphasized rather than diminished by the recent activity of Protestant writers who have entered the field with a breadth of vision far exceeding that of their predecessors, but still with disagreeable remnants of the old prejudices. The most that can be expected from a Protestant writer is that he present the story of the Papacy to his readers, if without travesty of the facts, at least with a lack of sympathy that has a chilling effect. To the Protestant the Pope is ever the "ambitious prelate" who, without warrant or justification, is intent on building up a despotic rule semi-religious and semi-political. The mightiest struggles of the Roman Pontiffs for the preservation of the sacred deposit of the faith are, in the eyes of modern indifferentism, mere squabbles over theological puerilities. If that dear old martyr, Pope Martin I., is "insulted, loaded with chains, imprisoned and banished to the remote Crimea," by the execrable tyrant, Constans II., this is because he was "hot-headed."* Of what import is it to Protestant writers whether there be One Will in Christ or twenty? That the noble Pontiffs who resisted the Iconoclastic Emperors should fare badly in Protestant hands was only to be expected, for Protestantism and Iconoclasm are synonyms. Worst of all fare the great Popes of the later decades of the eighth century who committed the unpardonable sin of founding the Temporal Power of the Papacy. Some commiseration may be shown to the victims of Byzantine despotism, but scant justice is doled out to the Stephens and Hadrians who placed the Holy See in a position of complete independence. It would be a criminal dereliction of duty on the part of Catholic scholars to force our people to glean their information regarding the grand heroes of our faith from the unfriendly pages of a Gregorovius or a Hodgkin. Great as are the merits of these and other non-Catholic writers of the school of Ranke, it is undeniable that throughout their writings there runs the unvarying undercurrent of ill-will and aversion to the Papacy and the other institutions of the Catholic Church. Unless, therefore, an antidote be speedily forthcoming in the shape of a work, equally

*Oman's "Dark Ages," p. 276.

scientific, and at the same time loyally Catholic, it cannot but happen that our educated laity will unconsciously imbibe a spirit of cold and hostile criticism of everything sacred.

The volumes of Dr. Pastor's History that have already been translated teach us how impartially a Catholic historian can treat his subject, at the same time preserving a sincere and enthusiastic love for the Church of Christ. It remains for other writers to do for the earlier ages of the Church that which Pastor has done with so masterly a hand for the Church of Renaissance Days. We should be pleased if these champions of Catholic truth, in addition to the prime requisite of absolute accuracy and an exhaustive acquaintance with the original sources and the literature of their subject, would at least equal the standard non-Catholic authors in all the other qualifications of the accomplished historian. But we must not expect absolute perfection at the very beginning. A great deal has been done when a start has been made; and we ought not to be too exacting. It is in this spirit that we accord a hearty greeting to the work of Rev. Horace K. Mann, the first volume of which we have read with deep interest. It is the intention of the author to narrate the history of the Popes from the beginning of the Middle Ages until the period at which Pastor opens his narrative.

Though it would be inaccurate to say that in the person of Rev. Mr. Mann a great historian has appeared amongst us, nevertheless his work is one of considerable merit, and one which, we trust, will be widely read. He is a painstaking chronicler, who has made a careful study of his authorities, is scrupulously honest, and strings his facts together without ever calling in the aid of imagination. The narrative, therefore, is entirely lacking in color. His style is slipshod and at times ungrammatical, by no means worthy of the headmaster of a grammar school. We fail, moreover, to comprehend why his second volume should receive the somewhat Teutonic appellation of Vol. I., Part II. Why not plain Vol. II.? Is Hadrian I. more closely allied to the preceding Gregories than to the subsequent Leos? Withal, the reverend author has furnished us with a very serviceable work, one, no doubt, which will improve with the progress of the writing. We wish it success.

A Revolution in the Science of Cosmology. The Keystone to the Arch of Science. By *George Campbell.* 12mo., pp. 210, illustrated. Topeka, Kansas: Crane & Co.

We are told that the author of this book, a professor of and teacher of the natural sciences for many years, early became convinced that the theory of Cosmology as embodied in the text-books of science was not true, and needed revision. To correct this error,

and place the science on a higher plane of progress, occupied by other and less important branches of science, is the object of this primary work.

We are informed that the contents of this volume include the latest data bearing upon the question discussed herein, and the facts have been collated by the author wherever obtainable, from all parts of the world.

The great telescopes recently placed in position by the various progressive nations have completely revolutionized the science of Cosmology, and within the telescopic field we are now enabled to watch, and even photograph, the developing universe of matter, through the various stages of planetary growth, from the primary bases of cosmos to the fully developed world, like the earth and other globes of the system.

The author proposes to prove:

First. That atoms of space were, and are, the forms of original matter, from which were developed the material creation under a system of natural laws.

Second. The earth was not developed from a condition of intense heat; neither was the matter of the primitive earth fused, but is now gradually undergoing the fusion process as a result of natural law.

Third. The matter of primary earth was cold and frigid, possessing a temperature minus more than 460 degrees; and this intense cold, coupled with electricity, condensed the matter of interstellar space, and caused combinations of atoms to form and eventually worlds.

Fourth. When the matter of the earth was sufficiently condensed, under natural laws, to form a globe, the water being lighter than the solid matter rose to the surface; and the earth at that time was covered with water except a small continent at either pole—which continents were formed by the parting of the waters as the result of the revolution of the earth upon its axis.

Fifth. The polar continents being the first land to appear above the surface of the water, it follows that these continents are the cradle of primary animal and plant life upon the earth, as the other continents were not developed until a later period and under another system of natural laws.

Sixth. The law that developed what is now the Eastern and Western continents changed the temperature of the polar continents from a semi-tropical to one of great frigidity, and in which all forms of plant and animal life perished—went out amid the roar of a tempest, in the darkness of the night, in the terror of cosmic convulsions incident to planetary growth and world development, and the remains of these semi-tropical animals now constitute many of the

island groups of the Arctic seas; and even on the northern coast of Siberia polar elephants were cast ashore in such numbers that their tusks are now an article of merchandise, and are gathered and sold in great quantities by the natives as old ivory.

Seventh. This book is a revolution in science, and is so complete that it has been called the true theory of creation, including the birth, development and decay of planetary life under a system of natural laws, verified and illustrated by charts made from photographs of nebulæ of worlds and systems of worlds, showing the various stages of a developing universe, from the originary matter of cosmos—the atoms of interstellar space.

This is a very interesting list of propositions, and the author treats them in a most attractive manner. It is not our purpose to discuss the scientific value of the book, but the writer is so clear in his statements that he leaves no room for misunderstanding.

THE TREASURE OF THE CHURCH; or, the Sacraments of Daily Life. By *Very Rev. J. B. Bagshawe, D. D.*, Canon Penitentiary of Southwark, author of "The Threshold of the Catholic Church," etc. 12mo., pp. xi.—242. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Canon Bagshawe's former works are so well known and appreciated that the Catholic should be willing to take anything from his pen on faith. His "Threshold of the Catholic Church" and "Credentials of the Catholic Church" have been leading wandering sheep to the true fold for many years. He was particularly fitted for work of this kind. The Bishop of Southwark says of him: "The late Canon Bagshawe was a priest for over fifty years, some forty of which were spent in the pastoral care of the mission of St. Elizabeth, at Richmond. Few men have attached greater importance to the spoken Word of God, and it was with reluctance that he ever allowed to pass unused any opportunity that came to him of preaching and explaining the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Thus every Sunday during his long ministry it was his habit to preach three, or even four times. His words were well prepared, and their arrangement carefully thought out, and he thus acquired a power of clear explanation, which was to serve him well when the moment came for him to address a wider audience. He felt that he might be of service to many souls by writing books explanatory of Christian Doctrine, which would help those who were still outside the unity of the Church, and give a better understanding of their religion to those who were already Catholics."

The volume before us has a pathetic interest because it engaged his attention during the last months of his life, and he passed to his reward before he could actually give it to the press.

In "The Treasure of the Church" he explains at length, but in a clear and simple manner, the two sacraments which are in constant use among the faithful—the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist and the Sacrament of Penance.

In this ,the last effort of his zeal and experience, Catholics will find a ready means of acquainting themselves with the place and position which, according to the teaching of the Church, these two great sacraments should hold in their lives. They will learn to understand more of the Divine Liturgy which surrounds the presence of Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, and how better to enter into the spirit of that worship. They will see, too, how to profit by the dwelling of our Lord within them in Holy Communion, and how to avail themselves to the full of the cleansing power and the strengthening grace of the Sacrament of Penance. No one can read this book without finding in it a fresher knowledge of his Faith, and a consequent stimulus to live more entirely according to its teaching.

Those who are not Catholics may use this work very profitably if they wish to know something of the order, and method, and reasonableness of the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Want of such knowledge is one of the greatest hindrances to their acceptance of her claims, and we may be sure that the enlightenment which a treatise of this nature conveys, will remove many an obstacle from the path of those who are hesitating in their course.

Sermons on the Stations of the Cross, the Our Father, the Hail Mary, etc. By *Rev. B. J. Raycroft, A. M.* 8vo., pp. 339. New York: Pustet & Co.

Sermons for the Sundays and Feasts of the Year. By the Venerable Curé of Ars, *Jean Baptiste Marie Vianney.* 8vo., pp. 370. New York: Joseph L. Wagner.

The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass Explained in Sermons. A course of Seven Lenten Sermons, including a Sermon for Good Friday and Eleven Sermons on the Sacred Heart. By *Rev. J. Fuhlrott.* 8vo., pp. 83. New York: Joseph L. Wagner.

First Religious Instructions for Little Ones. The Catholic Faith Simply Explained to the Youngest Pupils, with Particular View to their Practical Moral Training. With an appendix, Instructions on First Communion, by Rev. Albert Schaffler. 8vo., pp. xxxiv., 208. New York: Joseph L. Wagner.

Short Sermons for Low Masses, for All the Sundays and Some Feast Days of the Year. By *L. Hoffner,* Priest of the Dominican Order. 8vo., pp. 152. New York: Joseph L. Wagner.

We are having an inundation of sermon books. They are not unalloyed blessings. They may do some good, but they also do much harm. All sermon books apologize for their appearance by saying that they are friends of the family and the preacher. They expect to furnish spiritual reading for the Christian household, and to lighten the burden of the overworked priest. We do not think that they do one or the other. The best spiritual reading for the family

is found in the New Testament, the Catechism, the Imitation of Christ, the Lives of the Saints, and some simple manual of explanation of the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church, like Catholic Belief and the Beauties of the Catholic Church. The best way for Catholics to get sermons is through the ears, and not through the eyes. That is Christ's way and the way of the apostles.

As for the overworked priest who has not time to prepare his own sermons, we have often heard of him, but have never met him. Experience teaches us that the busiest priest preaches oftenest and best. If he is busy about his Father's business, he is constantly gathering the best material for sermons, and he has no right to be busy about anything else. The priest who makes his daily meditation, says his daily Mass, reads his Breviary regularly, and devotes even a short time each day to spiritual books, does not need any one to write his sermons for him. But every priest is supposed to do this.

We must confess that we always feel hurt when we see the announcement in a sermon book that it is published for the benefit of those who have not the ability to prepare their own sermons. There are no such priests—should be none such. Any young man who has ability enough to make the course in any of our modern seminaries, has ability enough to prepare his own sermons.

One volume in the group of sermon books before us takes away from them all the excuses that are usually given for their publication. No priest could have been more poorly equipped, humanly speaking, for sermon composition and delivery than the Venerable Curé of Ars. And surely no priest in modern times led a more busy life than he. And yet we find before us the sermons of the Curé of Ars. We hope that no one will try to preach them until he has first tried to imitate the holy life of their venerable author.

We trust that no one will understand these remarks as applied especially to the group of sermon books before us. They are not to be taken in that way. The sermons in this collection are about up to the average of published sermons, but we can think of no good reason for their publication. We hope that they will not tempt the clergy to laziness. There is no more sublime mission than that of preaching the Gospel in the name of Christ. No man should be willing to let another usurp that office. Let us have only the sermons of masters to serve as models, and then let us write our own sermons, and preach them in God's name.

THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: Dogmatically, Liturgically and Ascetically Explained. By *Rev. Dr. Nicholas Gihr.* Translated from the Sixth German Edition. St. Louis, 1902. Herder. Price $4.00 net.

We extend the heartiest of welcomes to Dr. Gihr's great treatise on the Sacrifice of the Mass in his English dress, and trust that the

beginning thus made of rendering the solid labors of contemporary German Catholic theologians accessible to English readers will be zealously followed up. Every one of the volumes composing Herder's "Theologische Bibliothek" ought to be translated into our language. Regarding Dr. Gihr's work, we can only echo the unanimous chorus of applause with which it was greeted upon its first appearance and which has been shown to have been well merited by the rapidity with which its eight successive editions were exhausted. An opportunity is now given to our clergy and educated laity of demonstrating that they are as eager to peruse profound theological works as the Catholics of Germany. The subject of the Holy Sacrifice is one of intense interest to every true Catholic heart, and that the Catholics of America are second to none in their loyalty to the Divine Victim is witnessed by the flourishing growth of the Eucharistic League amongst us. Dr. Gihr's work ought to be adopted by the League as their official hand-book, and we hope that we shall be called upon to record the appearance of many a new edition. We regret that the modesty of the translator has concealed his identity from us, as we should be pleased to congratulate him by name on the excellence of his rendition, which in no passage that we have read betrays a foreign original. Is it too much to hope that a copy of the work will be found on the table of every priest in the country?

GESCHICHTE DER ALTKIRCHLICHEN LITTERATUR. Von *Otto Bardenhewer*, Doktor der Theologie und der Philosophie, Professor der Theologie an der Universität München. Erster Band. Vom Ausgauge des apostolischen Zeitalters bis zum Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder, 1902. 592 pages. Price, $3.50 net.

We have no hesitation in pronouncing the great work, the first volume of which lies before us, the most timely and most valuable Catholic publication of our time. The field of early Christian literature is by eminence the battle-ground of the contending forces of Catholicism and Rationalism; and it is to the advantage of the Catholic cause that this should be the case. We have nothing to fear, and everything to hope for, from the revival of interest in patristic studies which characterizes the present age. *Antiquam quaerite matrem*, has always been the motto of Catholics. The good results of recent investigations among the primitive Christian writers are already visible in the increased conservatism of men of the school of Harnack, who are reasoning themselves back into long-forsaken paths. But, meanwhile, it is imperatively needed that orthodox writers and thinkers should be careful to prevent the ground from being preëmpted by those who are not the heirs of Catholic tradition and whose conclusions, in consequence, are apt to be arbitrary and unsatisfactory. Now we are acquainted with

no one to whom the task of confronting the Rationalist school could more safely be entrusted than the veteran Professor Bardenhewer of Munich, whose earlier work on Patrology is long and favorably known. He has set to work with a deliberateness which fills us with confidence. He promises to accomplish the task in six volumes; and if the succeeding tomes are as full and satisfactory as the first, we shall have no other reason to complain than that he has chosen the German language rather than the Latin as the vehicle of his thoughts; for there is but slight prospect of so extensive a work being translated into English. Summaries and compendiums seem to be quite sufficient for the needs of our Catholic reading public.

INSTRUCTIONS ON PREACHING, CATECHISING AND CLERICAL LIFE. By Saints and Fathers of the Church. Translated by the Rev. Patrick Boyle, C. M. 12mo., pp. x. x 221. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"The instructions contained in this volume have been translated into English in the hope that they may be useful to ecclesiastical students. They contain the thoughts on preaching and on the virtues of the clerical state of men whose sanctity, learning and practical experience entitle them to speak with authority." At the beginning of the volume the decrees of the Council of Trent on preaching are given, together with some extracts from the statutes of Irish synods to show how that duty was fulfilled in times of difficulty. Then follow the Instructions, and the book is closed with a list of authors who have treated of sacred eloquence, and of some works of reference. In the "Table of Contents" we find: "A Short Treatise on Preaching by St. Francis Borgia," "A Letter of St. Francis of Sales on Preaching," "The Method of Preaching Recommended by St. Vincent de Paul," "A Letter of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars on Preaching, A. D. 1894," "A Treatise of St. Augustine: De Catechizandis Rudibus," "A Treatise of St. Jerome on the Virtues of the Clerical State."

This is a splendid array of talent, and if the young preacher will put away his sermon books, and study this little volume, he will soon forget sermon books altogether. They are certainly an evil of modern times, and books like the one before us are good antidotes. We have material in abundance, and here are the masters to teach us how to use it.

EINLEITUNG IN DAS NEUE TESTAMENT. Von *Dr. Johannes Belser,* ord. Professor der Theologie an der Universität zu Tübingen. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $4.20 net.

We feel grateful to the sensible Bishop who overcame Professor Belser's scruples about publishing a new *Introduction to the New*

Testament by urging that: "Ein gutes Buch hat immer noch Platz." It is no disparagement of the excellent labors of previous writers when one who has made a thorough study of his subject goes over the ground once more. This is particularly true in the department of Biblical Science, which is being so zealously cultivated at the present time by specialists of every shade of religious belief. The large volume of 852 pages with which the Tübingen professor has enriched the Catholic literature of the subject will no doubt hold the field for many a day. Its erudition is stupendous. The style is clear and attractive. The arrangement is scientific and original. The writings of each of the sacred penmen are studied together, enabling the reader to take a more comprehensive view of the personality and message of each. A copious index of names and things greatly facilitates the perusal of the work. As usual with Mr. Herder's publications, the typographical part of the work is as near perfection as one could desire. Any one who has mastered this book is fully equipped with Biblical knowledge and need not shrink from encountering the ablest advocates of Rationalism.

THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE. By the *Rev. Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr.*, Ph. D., Lecturer in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. Folio gilt, pp. 64. Illustrated. Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Co.

The twelve papers which form this volume were first published in the *Living Church*. The author assures us that it was not his intention to write a history of an art so complex as architecture, and therefore the book is in no sense exhaustive. His object, he says, has been much more modest, and he has aimed at what is more easy of accomplishment. He has merely taken a series of buildings that may be regarded as typical of the stages through which Christian architecture has passed and used them to illustrate the development of a great form of art. With subordinate lines of development, with the marvelous decoration that has arisen in connection with the great styles, he has had very little to do, referring to them only as they have been intimately connected with the constructional principles of the building itself.

He then describes the principles on which he has worked, and they are few and simple. There may be some difference of opinion about the principles, as there may be about the types which he has chosen to illustrate the development of the art, but all will agree that the author has written very entertainingly and illustrated his text aptly and artistically. The book presents a handsome appearance and is worthy of the attention of all who are interested in ecclesiastical architecture.

CASUS CONSCIENTIÆ ad usum Confessariorum compositi et soluti ab *Augustino Lehmkuhl, S. J.* Vol. II., De Sacramentis. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $2.40 net.

Father Lehmkuhl, whose valuable Moral Theology has all but superseded every previous handbook in that department of theological science, is now issuing a work which may be looked upon as a corollary to his greater work, and which, no doubt, will enjoy an equal renown. He deems it advisable to forestall the stock objection against *casuistry*, but every sensible man must agree that the application of theolqgical principles to concrete cases is as useful and important as are the practical problems in arithmetic or geometry which test the student's mastery of principles. In the exercise of the sacred ministry it is precisely the concrete case which we always encounter, and it is an immense advantage, equivalent almost to personal intercourse, to observe how a great master deals with the case in hand. This is all the more beneficial when we watch the process in the hands of a truly scientific teacher like Lehmkuhl, who never takes a step without explaining carefully all the principles by which he is guided. He begins with volume second, since the subject of the sacraments is most fruitful of perplexities; but we are promised the first volume in the course of the year. No words of ours are needed to commend the work of a Lehmkuhl to our readers.

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE ET LATINE. Ed. Fr. Brandscheid. Pars Prior: "Evangelia;" price, $1.00 net. Pars Altera: "Apostolicum," price, $1.10 net.

This is a pocket edition of Fr. Brandscheid's excellent Greek and Latin Testament. The lowness of price brings it into the reach of all ecclesiastical students. The type is remarkably clear and attractive; and it makes us envy the lot of the young men who can study their Testament with a book like this, so different from the repellent Greek type of our boyhood.

Each volume is sold separately; and other editions are promised in which the Greek and the Latin texts will be given alone. To the volume containing the Gospels a brief dissertation is prefixed "De Principiis Textus Graeci Adornandi." There is surely no reason why every priest and seminarian should not now possess a Greek Testament.

DIE WIRKUNGEN DES BUSSSAKRAMENT es nach der Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin. Von *Michael Buchberger*. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, 85 cents.

A critical dissertation, crowned by the Royal University of Munich, in which the learned writer clearly proves that the Angelic Doctor consistently taught throughout his entire career the doctrine afterwards sanctioned by the Council of Trent concerning the efficacy of the Sacrament of Penance. This author will undoubtedly be heard from in the future.

70760

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

PERIODICAL